DUE DATE

Acc No ________________

Late ... or first 15 days
Rs 2 ... ys of the due date,

ESSAYS

LITERARY, MORAL

AND

POLITICAL

BY

DAVID HUME, Esq,

THE HISTORIAN

LONDON

WARD, LOCK & CO, LIMITED

WARWICK HOUSE SALISBURY SQUARE E

NEW YORK AND MELBOURNE.

BRADBURY AGNEW & CO LD., PRINTERS,
LONDON AND TONBRIDGE.

ADVERTISEMENT

MOST of the principles and reasonings, contained in this volume, were published in a work in three volumes, called *A Treatise of Human Nature* a work which the author had projected before he left college, and which he wrote and published not long after But not finding it successful, he was sensible of his error in going to the press too early, and he cast the whole anew in the following pieces, where some negligences in his former reasoning, and more in the expression, are, he hopes, corrected Yet several writers, who have honoured the author's philosophy with answers have taken care to direct all their batteries against that juvenile work, which the author never acknowledged, and have affected to triumph in any advantages which, they imagined, they had obtained over it Henceforth, the author desires that the following pieces may alone be regarded as containing his philosophical sentiments and principles.

CONTENTS

		PAGES
Essay I	Of the Delicacy of Taste and Passion	9—11
II	Of the Liberty of the Press	11—13
III	That Politics may be reduced to a Science	13—22
IV	Of the First Principles of Government	23—25
V	Of the Origin of Government	25—28
VI	Of the Independence of Parliament	28—31
VII	Whether the British Government inclines more to absolute Monarchy, or to a Republic	31—35
VIII	Of Parties in General	35—40
IX	Of the Parties of Great Britain	40—45
X	Of the Dignity or Meanness of Human Nature	45—49
XI	Of Civil Liberty	49—55
XII	Of Eloquence	55—63
XIII	Rise and Progress of the Arts and Sciences	63—79
XIV	The Epicurean	79—84
XV	The Stoic	84—90
XVI	The Platonist	90—93
XVII	The Sceptic	93—107
XVIII	Of Polygamy and Divorces	107—113
XIX	Of Simplicity and Refinement in Writing	113—116
XX	Of National Characters	116—127
XXI	Of Tragedy	127—133
XXII	Of the Standard of Taste	134—149
XXIII	Of Commerce	149—158
XXIV	Of Refinement in the Arts	159—167
XXV	Of Money	167—175
XXVI	Of Interest	176—184
XXVII	Of the Balance of Trade	184—195
XXVIII	Of the Jealousy of Trade	195—198
XXIX	Of the Balance of Power	198—203
XXX	Of Taxes	203—207
XXXI.	Of Public Credit	207—217
XXXII	Of some Remarkable Customs	217—222
XXXIII	Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations	222—269
XXXIV	Of the Original Contract	270—283
XXXV.	Of Passive Obedience	283—286
XXXVI.	Of the Coalition of Parties	286—291
XXXVII	Of the Protestant Succession	291—298
XXXVIII.	Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth	298—308

XXXIX. An Inquiry concerning Human Understanding

Sect. I	Of the different species of Philosophy	308—316
II.	Of the Origin of Ideas	316—320
III.	Of the Association of Ideas	320—321

CONTENTS.

		PAGES
IV.	Sceptical Doubts concerning the Operations of Understanding . . .	321—331
V	Sceptical Solution of these Doubts . .	331—341
VI	Of Probability .	341—343
VII	Of the Idea of Necessary Connection .	343—355
VIII	Of Liberty and Necessity .	356—371
IX	Of the Reason of Animals	371—374
X	Of the Academical or Sceptical Philosophy	374—385
XL	A DISSERTATION ON THE PASSIONS	385—407
XLI	AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALS	
Sect I	Of the general Principles of Morals	407—411
II	Of Benevolence . .	411—415
III	Of Justice	415—429
IV	Of Political Society . . .	429—433
V	Why Utility pleases . .	433—446
VI	Of Qualities useful to Ourselves	446—456
VII	Of Qualities immediately agreeable to Ourselves	456—463
VIII	Of Qualities immediately agreeable to Others	463—478
Append I	Concerning Moral Sentiment	478—484
II	Of Self-love	484—489
III	Some farther considerations with regard to Justice .	489—494
IV	Of some Verbal Disputes . .	494—501
XLII	A DIALOGUE	501—514
XLIII	THE NATURAL HISTORY OF RELIGION Introduction	514—515
I	Polytheism was the Primary Religion of Men	515—518
II	Origin of Polytheism .	518—520
III	The same Subject continued	520—523
IV	Deities not considered as Creators or Formers of the World	523—527
V	Various Forms of Polytheism Allegory, Hero-Worship	527—530
VI	Origin of Theism from Polytheism . .	530—533
VII	Confirmation of this doctrine .	533—534
VIII	Flux and Reflux of Polytheism and Theism .	534—536
IX	Comparison of these Religions with regard to Persecution and Toleration	536—538
X.	With regard to Courage or Abasement . .	538—539
XI	With Regard to Reason or Absurdity . .	540—541
XII	With Regard to Doubt or Conviction . .	541—547
XIII	Conceptions of the Divine Nature in Religion	547—549
XIV	Bad Influence of Popular Religions on Morality	549—551
XV	General Corollary	551—552

OF MIRACLES . . .	553—568
OF A PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE AND OF A FUTURE STATE	568—579
OF SUPERSTITION AND ENTHUSIASM . . .	579—583

HUME'S ESSAYS.

I.—OF THE DELICACY OF TASTE AND PASSION

SOME people are subject to a certain *delicacy* of *passion*, which makes them extremely sensible to all the accidents of life, and gives them a lively joy upon every prosperous event, as well as a piercing grief, when they meet with misfortunes and adversity. Favours and good offices easily engage their friendship; while the smallest injury provokes their resentment. Any honour or mark of distinction elevates them above measure; but they are as sensibly touched with contempt. People of this character have, no doubt, more lively enjoyments, as well as more pungent sorrows, than men of cool and sedate tempers: but, I believe, when everything is balanced, there is no one, who would not rather be of the latter character, were he entirely master of his own disposition. Good or ill fortune is very little at our disposal: and when a person, that has this sensibility of temper, meets with any misfortune, his sorrow or resentment takes entire possession of him, and deprives him of all relish in the common occurrences of life; the right enjoyment of which forms the chief part of our happiness. Great pleasures are much less frequent than great pains; so that a sensible temper must meet with fewer trials in the former way than in the latter. Not to mention, that men of such lively passions are apt to be transported beyond all bounds of prudence and discretion, and to take false steps in the conduct of life, which are often irretrievable.

There is a *delicacy* of *taste* observable in some men, which very much resembles this *delicacy* of *passion*, and produces the same sensibility to beauty and deformity of every kind, as that does to prosperity and adversity, obligations and injuries. When you present a poem or a picture to a man possessed of this talent, the delicacy of his feelings makes him be sensibly touched with every part of it; nor are the masterly strokes perceived with more exquisite relish and satisfaction, than the negligences or absurdities with disgust and uneasiness. A polite and judicious conversation affords him the highest entertainment; rudeness or impertinence is as great a punishment to him. In short, delicacy of taste has the same effect as delicacy of passion: it enlarges the sphere both of our happiness and misery, and makes us

sensible to the pains as well as to the pleasures, which escape the rest of mankind.

I believe, however, every one will agree with me that, notwithstanding this resemblance, delicacy of taste is as much to be desired and cultivated, as delicacy of passion is to be lamented, and to be remedied, if possible The good or ill accidents of life are very little at our disposal; but we are pretty much masters what books we shall read, what diversions we shall partake of, and what company we shall keep Philosophers have endeavoured to render happiness entirely independent of everything external The degree of perfection is impossible to be *attained*, but every wise man will endeavour to place his happiness on such objects chiefly as depend upon himself and *that* is not to be *attained* so much by any other means as by this delicacy of sentiment When a man is possessed of that talent, he is more happy by what pleases his taste, than by what gratifies his appetites, and receives more enjoyment from a poem or a piece of reasoning than the most expensive luxury can afford

Whatever connection there may be originally between these two species of delicacy, I am persuaded, that nothing is so proper to cure us of this delicacy of passion, as the cultivating of that higher and more refined taste, which enables us to judge of the characters of men, of compositions of genius, and of the productions of the nobler arts A greater or less relish for those obvious beauties, which strike the senses, depends entirely upon the greater or less sensibility of the temper but with regard to the sciences and liberal arts, a fine taste is, in some measure, the same with strong sense, or at least depends so much upon it that they are inseparable In order to judge aright of a composition of genius, there are so many views to be taken in, so many circumstances to be compared, and such a knowledge of human nature requisite, that no man, who is not possessed of the soundest judgment, will ever make a tolerable critic in such performances And this is a new reason for cultivating a relish in the liberal arts Our judgment will strengthen by this exercise we shall form juster notions of life Many things which please or afflict others, will appear to us too frivolous to engage our attention and we shall lose by degrees that sensibility and delicacy of passion, which is so incommodious

But perhaps I have gone too far, in saying that a cultivated taste for the polite arts extinguishes the passions, and renders us indifferent to those objects, which are so fondly pursued by the rest of mankind. On farther reflection, I find, that it rather improves our sensibility for all the tender and agreeable passions, at the same time that it renders the mind incapable of the rougher and more boisterous emotions.

Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes, Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros.

For this, I think, there may be assigned two very natural reasons. 1. Nothing is so improving to the temper as the study of the beauties,

either of poetry, eloquence, music, or painting They give a certain elegance of sentiment to which the rest of mankind are strangers. The emotions which they excite are soft and tender. They draw off the mind from the hurry of business and interest, cherish reflection, dispose to tranquility, and produce an agreeable melancholy, which, of all dispositions of the mind, is best suited to love and friendship.

II. A delicacy of taste is favourable to love and friendship, by confining our choice to few people, and making us indifferent to the company and conversation of the greater part of men You will seldom find that mere men of the world, whatever strong sense they may be endowed with, are very nice in distinguishing characters, or in marking those insensible differences and gradations, which make one man preferable to another Any one, that has competent sense, is sufficient for their entertainment they talk to him of their pleasures and affairs, with the same frankness that they would to another, and finding many who are fit to supply his place, they never feel any vacancy or want in his absence But to make use of the allusion of a celebrated French* author, the judgment may be compared to a clock or watch, where the most ordinary machinery is sufficient to tell the hours, but the most elaborate alone can point out the minutes and seconds, and distinguish the smallest differences of time, One that has well digested his knowledge both of books and men, has little enjoyment but in the company of a few select companions He feels too sensibly, how much all the rest of mankind fall short of the notions which he has entertained. And, his affections being thus confined within a narrow circle, no wonder he carries them further, than if they were more general and undistinguished The gaiety and frolic of a bottle companion improves with him into a solid friendship and the ardours of a youthful appetite become an elegant passion.

II—OF THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS

NOTHING is more apt to surprise a foreigner, than the extreme liberty, which we enjoy in this country, of communicating whatever we please to the public, and of openly censuring every measure, entered into by the King or his ministers If the administration resolve upon war, it is affirmed, that, either wilfully or ignorantly, they mistake the interests of the nation, and that peace, in the present situation of affairs, is infinitely preferable If the passion of the ministers lie towards peace, our political writers breathe nothing but war, and devastation, and represent the pacific conduct of the government as mean and pusil-

* FONTENELLE, *Pluralité des Mondes*, Soir 6.

lanimous As this liberty is not indulged in any other government, either republican or monarchical, in Holland and Venice, more than in France or Spain, it may very naturally give occasion to the question, *How it happens that Great Britain alone enjoys this peculiar privilege?*

The reason, why the laws indulge us in such a liberty, seems to be derived from our mixed form of government, which is neither wholly monarchical, nor wholly republican It will be found, if I mistake not, a true observation in politics, that the two extremes in government, liberty and slavery, commonly approach nearest to each other, and that, as you depart from the extremes, and mix a little of monarchy with liberty, the government becomes always the more free, and, on the other hand, when you mix a little of liberty with monarchy, the yoke becomes always the more grievous and intolerable In a government, such as that of France, which is absolute, and where law, custom, and religion concur, all of them, to make the people fully satisfied with their condition, the monarch cannot entertain any *jealousy* against his subjects, and therefore is apt to indulge them in great *liberties* both of speech and action In a government altogether republican, such as that of Holland, where there is no magistrate so eminent as to give *jealousy* to the state, there is no danger in intrusting the magistrates with large discretionary powers, and though many advantages result from such powers, in preserving peace and order, yet they lay a considerable restraint on men's actions, and make every private citizen pay a great respect to the government Thus it seems evident that the two extremes of absolute monarchy and of a republic, approach near to each other in some material circumstances I The magistrate has no jealousy of the people II The people have none of the magistrate which want of jealousy begets a mutual confidence and trust in both cases, and produces a species of liberty in monarchies, and of arbitrary power in republics

To justify the other part of the foregoing observation, that, in every government, the means are most wide of each other, and that the mixtures of monarchy and liberty render the yoke either more easy or more grievous, I must take notice of a remark in Tacitus with regard to the Romans under the emperors, that they neither could bear total slavery nor total liberty, *Nec totam servitutem, nec totam libertatem pati possunt* This remark a celebrated poet has translated and applied to the English, in his lively description of Queen Elizabeth's policy and government,

Et fit aimer son joug a l' Anglois indompte,
Qui ne peut ni servir, ni vivre en liberte

HENRIADE, *liv.* I.

According to these remarks, we are to consider the Roman govern-

ment under the emperors as a mixture of despotism and liberty, where the despotism prevailed, and the English government as a mixture of the same kind, where the liberty predominates The consequences are conformable to the foregoing observation, and as may be expected from those mixed forms of government, which beget a mutual watchfulness and jealously The Roman emperors were, many of them, the most frightful tyrants that ever disgraced human nature, and it is evident, that their cruelty was chiefly excited by their *jealousy*, and by their observing that all the great men of Rome bore with impatience the dominion of a family, which, but a little before, was nowise superior to their own On the other hand, as the republican part of the government prevails in England, though with a great mixture of monarchy, it is obliged, for its own preservation, to maintain a watchful *jealousy* over the magistrate, to remove all discretionary powers, and to secure every one's life and fortune by general and inflexible laws No action must be deemed a crime but what the law has plainly determined to be such no crime must be imputed to a man but from a legal proof before his judges and even these judges must be his fellow-subjects who are obliged, by their own interest, to have a watchful eye over the encroachments, and violence of the ministers From these causes it proceeds, that there is as much liberty, and even, perhaps licentiousness in Britain, as there were formerly slavery and tyranny in Rome

These principles account for the great liberty of the press in these kingdoms, beyond what is indulged in any other government It is apprehended, that arbitrary power would steal in upon us, were we not careful to prevent its progress, and were there not an easy method of conveying the alarm from one end of the kingdom to the other The spirit of the people must frequently be roused, in order to curb the ambition of the court, and the dread of rousing this spirit must be employed to prevent that ambition Nothing so effectual to this purpose as the liberty of the press by which all the learning, wit, and genius of the nation, may be employed on the side of freedom, and every one be animated to its defence As long, therefore as the republican part of our government can maintain itself against the monarchical, it will naturally be careful to keep the press open, as of importance to its own preservation

It must however be allowed, that the unbounded liberty of the press, though it be difficult, perhaps impossible, to propose a suitable remedy for it, is one of the evils attending mixed forms of government.

III —THAT POLITICS MAY BE REDUCED TO A SCIENCE.

It is a question with several, whether there be any essential difference between one form of government and another? and whether

every form may not become good or bad, according as it is well or ill administered*? Were it once admitted, that all governments are alike, and that the only difference consists in the character and conduct of the governors, most political disputes would be at an end, and all *zeal* for one constitution above another must be esteemed mere bigotry and folly. But though a friend to moderation, I cannot forbear condemning this sentiment, and should be sorry to think, that human affairs admit of no greater stability, than what they receive from the casual humours and characters of particular men.

It is true, those who maintain, that the goodness of all government consists in the goodness of the administration, may cite many particular instances in history, where the very same government, in different hands, has varied suddenly into the two opposite extremes of good and bad. Compare the French government under Henry III. and under Henry IV. Oppression, levity, artifice on the part of the rulers; faction, sedition, treachery, rebellion, disloyalty on the part of the subjects: these compose the character of the former miserable era. But when the patriot and heroic prince, who succeeded, was once firmly seated on the throne, the government, the people, every thing, seemed to be totally changed; and all from the difference of the temper and conduct of these two sovereigns. Instances of this kind may be multiplied, almost without number, from ancient as well as modern history, foreign as well as domestic.

But here it may be proper to make a distinction. All absolute governments must very much depend on the administration; and this is one of the great inconveniences attending that form of government. But a republican and free government would be an obvious absurdity, if the particular checks and controls, provided by the constitution, had really no influence, and made it not the interest, even of bad men, to act for the public good. Such is the intention of these forms of government, and such is their real effect, where they are wisely constituted: as on the other hand, they are the source of all disorder, and of the blackest crimes, where either skill or honesty has been wanting in their original frame and institution.

So great is the force of laws, and of particular forms of government, and so little dependence have they on the humours and tempers of men, that consequences almost as general and certain may sometimes be deduced from them, as any which the mathematical sciences will afford us.

The constitution of the Roman republic gave the whole legislative power to the people, without allowing a negative voice either to the nobility or consul. This unbounded power they

* *For forms of government let fools contest, Whate'er is best administered is best.*
Essay on Man, Book 3.

possessed in a collective, not in a representative body The consequences were: when the people, by success and conquest, had become very numerous, and had spread themselves to a great distance from the capital, the city-tribes, though the most contemptible, carried almost every vote they were, therefore, most cajoled by every one that affected popularity they were supported in idleness by the general distribution of corn, and by particular bribes, which they received from almost every candidate by this means, they became every day more licentious, and the Campus Martius was a perpetual scene of tumult and sedition armed slaves were introduced among these rascally citizens, so that the whole government fell into anarchy, and the greatest happiness, which the Romans could look for, was the despotic power of the Cæsars. Such are the effects of democracy without a representative.

A Nobility may possess the whole, or any part of the legislative power of a state, in two different ways Either every nobleman shares the power as a part of the whole body, or the whole body enjoys the power as composed of parts, which have each a distinct power and authority The Venetian aristocracy is an instance of the first kind of government, the Polish, of the second In the Venetian Government the whole body of nobility possesses the whole power, and no nobleman has any authority which he receives not from the whole In the Polish government every nobleman, by means of his fiefs, has a distinct hereditary authority over his vassals, and the whole body has no authority but what it receives from the concurrence of its parts The different operations and tendencies of these two species of government might be made apparent even *a priori* A Venetian nobility is preferable to a Polish, let the humours and education of men be ever so much varied. A nobility who possess their power in common, will preserve peace and order, both among themselves, and their subjects, and no member can have authority enough to control the laws for a moment. The nobles will preserve their authority over the people, but without any grievous tyranny or any breach of private property because such a tyrannical government promotes not the interests of the whole body, however it may that of some individuals There will be a distinction of rank between the nobility and people, but this will be the only distinction in the state The whole nobility will form one body, and the whole people another, without any of those private feuds and animosities, which spread ruin and desolation everywhere. It is easy to see the disadvantages of a Polish nobility in every one of these particulars.

It is possible so to constitute a free government, as that a single person, call him a doge, prince, or king, shall possess a large share of power, and shall form a proper balance or counterpoise to the other parts of the legislature. This chief magistrate may be either elec-

tive or *hereditary*, and though the former institution may, to a superficial view, appear the most advantageous, yet a more accurate inspection will discover in it greater inconveniences than in the latter, and such as are founded on causes and principles eternal and immutable. The filling of the throne, in such a government, is a point of too great and too general interest, not to divide the whole people into factions whence a civil war, the greatest of ills, may be apprehended, almost with certainty, upon every vacancy The prince elected must be either a *Foreigner* or a *Native* The former will be ignorant of the people whom he is to govern suspicious of his new subjects, and suspected by them, giving his confidence entirely to strangers, who will have no other care but of enriching themselves in the quickest manner while their master's favour and authority are able to support them A native will carry into the throne all his private animosities and friendships, and will never be viewed in his elevation, without exciting the sentiment of envy in those who formerly considered him as their equal. Not to mention that a crown is too high a reward ever to be given to merit alone, and will always induce the candidates to employ force, or money, or intrigue, to procure the votes of the electors so that such an election will give no better chance for superior merit in the prince, than if the state had trusted to birth alone for determining their sovereign

It may therefore be pronounced as an universal axiom in politics, *That an hereditary prince, a nobility without vassals, and a people voting by their representatives, form the best* MONARCHY, ARISTOCRACY, *and* DEMOCRACY But in order to prove more fully, that politics admit of general truths, which are invariable by the humour or education either of subject or sovereign, it may not be amiss to observe some other principles of this science, which may seem to deserve that character

It may easily be observed, that, though free governments have been commonly the most happy for those who partake of their freedom, yet are they the most ruinous and oppressive to their provinces and this observation may, I believe, be fixed as a maxim of the kind we are here speaking of When a monarch extends his dominions by conquest, he soon learns to consider his old and his new subjects as on the same footing, because, in reality, all his subjects are to him the same, except the few friends and favourites, with whom he is personally acquainted. He does not, therefore, make any distinction between them in his *general* laws, and, at the same time, is careful to prevent all *particular* acts of oppression on the one as well as on the other But a free state necessarily makes a great distinction, and must always do so, till men learn to love their neighbours as well as themselves The conquerors, in such a government, are all legislators,

and will be sure to contrive matters, by restrictions on trade, and by taxes, so as to draw some private, as well as public, advantage from their conquests. Provincial governors have also a better chance, in a republic, to escape with their plunder, by means of bribery or intrigue; and their fellow-citizens, who find their own state to be enriched by the spoils of the subject provinces, will be the more inclined to tolerate such abuses. Not to mention, that it is a necessary precaution in a free state to change the governors frequently; which obliges these temporary tyrants to be more expeditious and rapacious, that they may accumulate sufficient wealth before they give place to their successors. What cruel tyrants were the Romans over the world during the time of their commonwealth! It is true, they had laws to prevent oppression in their provincial magistrates; but Cicero informs us, that the Romans could not better consult the interests of the provinces than by repealing these very laws. For, in that case, says he, our magistrates, having entire impunity, would plunder no more than would satisfy their own rapaciousness; whereas, at present, they must also satisfy that of their judges, and of all the great men in Rome, of whose protection they stand in need. Who can read of the cruelties and oppressions of Verres without astonishment? And who is not touched with indignation to hear, that, after Cicero had exhausted on that abandoned criminal all the thunders of his eloquence, and had prevailed so far as to get him condemned to the utmost extent of the laws; yet that cruel tyrant lived peaceably to old age, in opulence and ease, and, thirty years afterwards, was put into the proscription by Mark Antony, on account of his exorbitant wealth, where he fell with Cicero himself, and all the most virtuous men of Rome? After the dissolution of the common-wealth, the Roman yoke became easier upon the provinces, as Tacitus informs us, [Ann. lib. i. cap. 2.] and it may be observed, that many of the worst emperors, Domitian, [Suet. in vita Domit.] for instance, were careful to prevent all oppression on the provinces. In Tiberius's* time, Gaul was esteemed richer than Italy itself. Nor do I find, during the whole time of the Roman monarchy, that the empire became less rich or populous in any of its provinces; though indeed its valour and military discipline were always upon the decline. The oppression and tyranny of the Carthaginians over their subject states in Africa went so far, as we learn from Polybius, [Lib. i. cap. 72.] that, not content with exacting the half of all the produce of the land, which of itself was a very high rent, they also loaded them with many other taxes. If we pass from ancient to modern times, we shall still find the observation to hold. The provinces of absolute monarchies are always better treated than those of free states. Compare

* "Egregium resumendae libertati tempus, si ipsi florentes, quam inops Italia, quam imbellis urbana plebs, nihil validum in exercitibus, nisi quod externum cogitarent."—Tacit. Ann. lib. iii.

the *Pais conquis* of France with Ireland, and you will be convinced of this truth; though this latter kingdom, being, in a good measure, peopled from England, possesses so many rights and privileges as should naturally make it challenge better treatment than that of a conquered province. The island of Corsica is also an obvious instance to the same purpose.

There is an observation in Machiavel, with regard to the conquests of Alexander the Great, which, I think, may be regarded as one of those eternal political truths, which no time nor accidents can vary. It may seem strange, says that politician, that such sudden conquests, as those of Alexander, should be possessed so peaceably by his successors, and that the Persians, during all the confusions and civil wars among the Greeks, never made the smallest effort towards the recovery of their former independent government. To satisfy us concerning the cause of this remarkable event, we may consider, that a monarch may govern his subjects in two different ways He may either follow the maxims of the eastern princes, and stretch his authority so far as to leave no distinction of rank among his subjects, but what proceeds immediately from himself. no advantages of birth, no hereditary honours and possessions, and, in a word, no credit among the people, except from his commission alone Or a monarch may exert his power after a milder manner, like other European princes, and leave other sources of honour, beside his smile and favour birth, titles, possessions, valour, integrity, knowledge, or great and fortunate achievements In the former species of government, after a conquest, it is impossible ever to shake off the yoke, since no one possesses, among the people, so much personal credit and authority as to begin such an enterprise whereas, in the latter, the least misfortune, or discord among the victors, will encourage the vanquished to take arms, who have leaders ready to prompt and conduct them in every undertaking*

* I have taken it for granted, according to the supposition of Machiavel that the ancient Persians had no nobility though there is reason to suspect, that the Florentine secretary, who seems to have been better acquainted with the Roman than the Greek authors, was mistaken in this particular The more ancient Persians, whose manners are described by Xenophon, were a free people, and had nobility Their ὁμότιμοι were preserved even after the extending of their conquests and the consequent change of their government. Arrian mentions them in Darius' time, *De exped Alex* lib ii. Historians also speak often of the persons in command as men of family Tygranes, who was general of the Medes under Xerxes, was of the race of Achmænes, Herod. lib vii cap 62 Artachæus, who directed the cutting of the canal about mount Athos, was of the same family Id. cap 117 Megabyzus was one of the seven eminent Persians who conspired against the Magi. His son, Zopyrus, was in the highest command under Darius, and delivered Babylon to him. His grandson, Megabyzus, commanded the army defeated at Marathon. His great grandson, Zopyrus, was also eminent, and was banished Persia. Herod. lib. iii. Thuc. lib i. Rosaces, who commanded an army in Egypt under Artaxerxes, was also descended from one of the seven conspirators, Diod. Sic. lib. xvi. Agesilaus, in Xenophon. Hist. Græc. lib. iv being desirous of making a marriage betwixt king Cotys his ally, and the daughter of Spithridates, a Persian of rank, who had deserted to him, first asked Cotys what family Spithridates is of. One of the most considerable in Persia, says Cotys. Ariæus, when offered the sovereignty by Clearchus and the ten thousand Greeks, refused it as of too low a rank, and said, that so many eminent Persians would never endure his rule. *Id. de exped.* lib. ii. Some of the families descended from the seven Persians above-mentioned remained during Alexander's successors: and Mithridates, in

Such is the reasoning of Machiavel, which seems solid and conclusive; though I wished he had not mixed falsehood with truth, in asserting, that monarchies, governed according to eastern policy, though more easily kept when once subdued, yet are the most difficult to subdue; since they cannot contain any powerful subject, whose discontent and faction may facilitate the enterprises of an enemy. For besides, that such a tyrannical government enervates the courage of men, and renders them indifferent towards the fortunes of their sovereign; besides this, I say, we find by experience, that even the temporary and delegated authority of the generals and magistrates, being always, in such governments, as absolute within its sphere, as that of the prince himself, is able, with barbarians, accustomed to a blind submission, to produce the most dangerous and fatal revolutions. So that in every respect, a gentle government is preferable, and gives the greatest security to the sovereign as well as the subject.

Legislators, therefore, ought not to trust the future government of a state entirely to chance, but ought to provide a system of laws to regulate the administration of public affairs to the latest posterity. Effects will always correspond to causes; and wise regulations, in any commonwealth, are the most valuable legacy that can be left to future ages. In the smallest court or office, the stated forms and methods, by which business must be conducted, are found to be a considerable check on the natural depravity of mankind. Why should not the case be the same in public affairs? Can we ascribe the stability and wisdom of the Venetian government, through so many ages, to any thing but the form of government? And is it not easy to point out these defects in the original constitution, which produced the tumultuous governments of Athens and Rome, and ended at last in the ruin of these two famous republics? And so little dependence has this affair on the humours and education of particular men, that one part of the same republic may be wisely conducted, and another weakly, by the very same men, merely on account of the difference of the forms and institutions by which these parts are regulated. Historians inform us that this was actually the case with Genoa. For while the state was always full of sedition, and tumult, and disorder, the bank of St. George, which had become a considerable part

Antiochus' time, is said by Polybius to be descended from one of them, lib. v. cap. 43. Artabazus was esteemed, as Arrian says, ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις Περσῶν lib. iii. And when Alexander married in one day 80 of his captains to Persian women, his intention plainly was to ally the Macedonians with the most eminent Persian families. Id. lib. vii. Diodorus Siculus says, they were of the most noble birth in Persia, lib. xvii. The government of Persia was despotic, and conducted in many respects after the eastern manner, but was not carried so far as to extirpate all nobility, and confound all ranks and orders. It left men who were still great, by themselves and their family, independent of their office and commission. And the reason why the Macedonians kept so easily dominion over them was owing to other causes easy to be found in the historians; though it must be owned that Machiavel's reasoning is, in itself, just, however doubtful its application to the present case.

of the people, was conducted, for several ages, with the utmost integrity and wisdom*

The ages of greatest public spirit are not always most eminent for private virtue. Good laws may beget order and moderation in the government, where the manners and customs have instilled little humanity or justice into the tempers of men The most illustrious period of the Roman history, considered in a political view, is that between the beginning of the first and end of the last Punic war, the due balance between the nobility and people being then fixed by the contests of the tribunes, and not being yet lost by the extent of conquests. Yet at this very time, the horrid practice of poisoning was so common, that, during part of the season, a *Prætor* punished capitally for this crime above 3000 [T Livii, lib xl cap 43] persons in a part of Italy, and found informations of this nature still multiplying upon him There is a similar, or rather a worse instance, [T Livii, lib viii cap, 18] in the more early times of the commonwealth. So depraved in private life were that people, whom in their histories we so much admire I doubt not but they were really more virtuous during the time of the two *Triumvirates*, when they were tearing their common country to pieces, and spreading slaughter and desolation over the face of the earth, merely for the choice of tyrants †

Here, then, is a sufficient inducement to maintain, with the utmost zeal, in every free state, those forms and institutions, by which liberty is secured, the public good consulted, and the avarice or ambition of particular men restrained and punished Nothing does more honour to human nature, than to see it susceptible of so noble a passion, as nothing can be a greater indication of meanness of heart in any man than to see him destitute of it A man who loves only himself, without regard to friendship and desert, merits the severest blame, and a man, who is only susceptible of friendship, without public spirit, or a regard to the community, is deficient in the most material part of virtue

But this is a subject which needs not be longer insisted on at present. There are enow of zealots on both sides, who kindle up the passions of their partizans, and, under pretence of public good, pursue the interests and ends of their particular faction For my part, I shall always be more fond of promoting moderation than zeal, though perhaps the surest way of producing moderation in every party is to increase our zeal for the public Let us therefore try, if it be possible, from the foregoing doctrine, to draw a lesson of moderation with re-

* "Essempio veramente raro, et da Filosofi intante lord imaginate et vedute Republiche mai non trovato, vedere dentro ad un medesimo cerchio, fra medesimi cittadini. la liberta, et la tirannide. la vita civile et la corotta, la giustitia et la licenza perche quello ordine solo mantiere quella citta piena di costumi antichi et venerabili. E s'egli auvenisse (che col tempo in ogni modo auverra) que San Giorgio tutta quel la citta occupasse, sarrebbe quella una Republica piu della Venetiana memorabile.—Della Hist Florentine. lib. viii."

† 'L'Aigle contre l Aigle, Romains contre Romains.
Combatans seulement pour le Choix de tyran.' CORNEILLE.

gard to the parties, into which our country is at present divided, at the same time, that we allow not this moderation to abate the industry and passion, with which every individual is bound to pursue the good of his country.

Those who either attack or defend a minister in such a government as ours, where the utmost liberty is allowed, always carry matters to an extreme, and exaggerate his merit or demerit with regard to the public. His enemies are sure to charge him with the greatest enormities, both in domestic and foreign management, and there is no meanness or crime, of which, in their account, he is not capable. Unnecessary wars, scandalous treaties, profusion of public treasure, oppressive taxes, every kind of mal-administration is ascribed to him. To aggravate the charge, his pernicious conduct, it is said, will extend its baneful influence even to posterity, by undermining the best constitution in the world, and disordering that wise system of laws, institutions, and customs by which our ancestors, during so many centuries, have been so happily governed. He is not only a wicked minister in himself, but has removed every security provided against wicked ministers for the future.

On the other hand, the partizans of the minister make his panegyric run as high as the accusation against him, and celebrate his wise, steady, and moderate conduct in every part of his administration. The honour and interest of the nation supported abroad, public credit maintained at home, persecution restrained, faction subdued, the merit of all these blessings is ascribed solely to the minister. At the same time, he crowns all his other merits by a religous care of the best constitution in the world, which he has preserved in all its parts, and has transmitted entire, to be the happiness and the security of the latest posterity.

When this accusation and panegyric are received by the partizans of each party, no wonder they beget an extraordinary ferment on both sides, and fill the nation with violent animosities. But I would fain persuade these party zealots, that there is a flat contradiction both in the accusation and panegyric, and that it were impossible for either of them to run so high, were it not for this contradiction. If our constitution be really *that noble fabric, the pride of Britain, the envy of our neighbours, raised by the labour of so many centuries, repaired at the expence of so many millions, and cemented by such a profusion of blood**, I say, if our constitution does in any degree deserve these eulogies, it would never have suffered a wicked and weak minister to govern triumphantly for a course of twenty years, when opposed by the greatest geniuses in the nation, who exercised the utmost liberty of tongue and pen, in parliament, and in their frequent appeals to the people. But, if the minister be wicked and weak, to the degree so strenuously insisted on,

* "Dissertation on Parties," Letter 10.

the constitution must be faulty in its original principles, and he cannot consistently be charged with undermining the best form of government in the world. A constitution is only so far good, as it provides a remedy against mal-administration, and if the British, when in its greatest vigour, and repaired by two such remarkable events, as the *Revolution* and *Accession*, by which our ancient royal family was sacrificed to it; if our constitution, I say, with so great advantages, does not, in fact, provide any such remedy, we are rather beholden to any minister who undermines it, and affords us an opportunity of erecting a better in its place

I would employ the same topics to moderate the zeal of those who defend the minister *Is our constitution so excellent?* Then a change of ministry can be no such dreadful event, since it is essential to such a constitution, in every ministry, both to preserve itself from violation, and to prevent all enormities in the administration *Is our constitution very bad?* Then so extraordinary a jealousy and apprehension, on account of changes, is ill placed, and a man should no more be anxious in this case, than a husband, who had married a woman from the stews, should be watchful to prevent her infidelity Public affairs, in such a government, must necessarily go to confusion, by whatever hands they are conducted, and the zeal of *patriots* is in that case much less requisite than the patience and submission of *philosophers* The virtue and good intentions of Cato and Brutus are highly laudable, but to what purpose did their zeal serve? Only to hasten the fatal period of the Roman government, and render its convulsions and dying agonies more violent and painful.

I would not be understood to mean, that public affairs deserve no care and attention at all Would men be moderate and consistent, their claims might be admitted, at least might be examined. The *country-party* might still assert, that our constitution, though excellent, will admit of mal-administration to a certain degree, and therefore, if the minister be bad, it is proper to oppose him with a *suitable* degree of zeal. And, on the other hand, the *court-party* may be allowed, upon the supposition that the minister were good, to defend, and with *some* zeal too, his administration. I would only persuade men not to contend, as if they were fighting *pro aris et focis*, and change a good constitution into a bad one, by the violence of their factions.

I have not here considered anything that is personal in the present controversy In the best civil constitution, where every man is restrained by the most rigid laws, it is easy to discover either the good or bad intentions of a minister, and to judge, whether his personal character deserve love or hatred. But such questions are of little importance to the public, and lay those, who employ their pens upon them, under a just suspicion either of malevolence or of flattery.

IV.—OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT

NOTHING appears more surprising to those who consider human affairs with a philosophical eye, than the easiness with which the many are governed by the few, and the implicit submission, with which men resign their own sentiments and passions to those of their rulers. When we enquire by what means this wonder is effected, we shall find, that, as Force is always on the side of the governed, the governors have nothing to support them but opinion. It is, therefore, on opinion only that government is founded; and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military governments, as well as to the most free and most popular. The soldan of Egypt, or the emperor of Rome, might drive his harmless subjects, like brute beasts, against their sentiments and inclination: but he must, at least, have led his *mamelukes*, or *prætorian bands*, like men, by their opinion.

Opinion is of two kinds, to wit, opinion of INTEREST, and opinion of RIGHT. By opinion of interest, I chiefly understand the sense of the general advantage which is reaped from government; together with the persuasion, that the particular government, which is established, is equally advantageous with any other that could easily be settled. When this opinion prevails among the generality of a state, or among those who have the force in their hands, it will give great security to any government.

Right is of two kinds; right to Power and right to Property. What prevalence opinion of the first kind has over mankind, may easily be understood, by observing the attachment which all nations have to their ancient government, and even to those names which have had the sanction of antiquity. Antiquity always begets the opinion of right; and whatever disadvantageous sentiments we may entertain of mankind, they are always found to be prodigal both of blood and treasure in the maintenance of public justice. There is, indeed, no particular, in which, at first sight, there may appear a greater contradiction in the frame of the human mind than the present. When men act in a faction, they are apt, without shame or remorse, to neglect all the ties of honour and morality, in order to serve their party; and yet, when a faction is formed upon a point of right or principle, there is no occasion, where men discover a greater obstinacy, and a more determined sense of justice and equity. The same social disposition of mankind is the cause of these contradictory appearances.

It is sufficiently understood, that the opinion of right to property is of moment in all matters of government. A noted author has made property the foundation of all government; and most of our political

writers seem inclined to follow him in that particular This is carrying the matter too far, but still it must be owned, that the opinion of right to property has a great influence in this subject.

Upon these three opinions, therefore, of public *interest*, of *right to power*, and of *right to property*, are all governments founded, and all authority of the few over the many There are indeed other principles, which add force to these, and determine, limit, or alter their operation, such as *self-interest*, *fear*, and *affection* but still we may assert, that these other principles can have no influence alone, but suppose the antecedent influence of those opinions above mentioned. They are, therefore, to be esteemed the secondary, not the original principles of government.

For, *first*, as to *self-interest* by which I mean the expectation of particular rewards, distinct from the general protection which we receive from government, it is evident that the magistrate's authority must be antecedently established, at least be hoped for, in order to produce this expectation. The prospect of reward may augment his authority with regard to some particular persons, but can never give birth to it, with regard to the public. Men naturally look for the greatest favours from their friends and acquaintance, and therefore, the hopes of any considerable number of the state would never center in any particular set of men, if these men had no other title to magistracy, and had no separate influence over the opinions of mankind. The same observation may be extended to the other two principles of *fear* and *affection* No man would have any reason to *fear* the fury of a tyrant, if he had no authority over any but from fear, since, as a single man, his bodily force can reach but a small way, and all the farther power he possesses must be founded either on our own opinion, or on the presumed opinion of others And though *affection* to wisdom and virtue in a *sovereign* extends very far, and has great influence, yet he must antecedently be supposed invested with a public character, otherwise the public esteem will serve him in no stead, nor will his virtue have any influence beyond a narrow sphere

A government may endure for several ages, though the balance of power, and the balance of property do not coincide This chiefly happens, where any rank or order of the state has acquired a large share in the property, but, from the original constitution of the government, has no share in the power Under what pretence would any individual of that order assume authority in public affairs? As men are commonly much attached to their ancient government, it is not to be expected, that the public would ever favour such usurpations. But where the original constitution allows any share of power, though small, to an order of men, who possess a large share of the property, it is easy for them gradually to stretch their authority, and bring

the balance of power to coincide with that of property This has been the case with the House of Commons in England.

Most writers, that have treated of the British government, have supposed, that, as the Lower House represents all the commons of Great Britain, its weight in the scale is proportioned to the property and power of all whom it represents But this principle must not be received as absolutely true For though the people are apt to attach themselves more to the House of Commons, than to any other member of the constitution, the House being chosen by them as their representatives, and as the public guardians of their liberty yet are there instances where the House, even when in opposition to the crown, has not been followed by the people, as we may particularly observe of the *tory* House of Commons in the reign of King William. Were the members obliged to receive instructions from their constituents, like the Dutch deputies, this would entirely alter the case, and if such immense power and riches, as those of all the commons of Great Britain, were brought into the scale, it is not easy to conceive, that the crown could either influence that multitude of people, or withstand that balance of property It is true, the crown has great influence over the collective body in the elections of members, but were this influence, which at present is only exerted once in seven years, to be employed in bringing over the people to every vote, it would soon be wasted, and no skill, popularity, or revenue, could support it. I must, therefore, be of opinion, that an alteration in this particular would introduce a total alteration in our government, and would soon reduce it to a pure republic, and, perhaps, to a republic of no inconvenient form For though the people, collected in a body like the Roman tribes, be quite unfit for government, yet, when dispersed in small bodies, they are more susceptible both of reason and order, the force of popular currents and tides is, in a great measure, broken, and the public interest may be pursued with some method and constancy But it is needless to reason any farther concerning a form of government, which is never likely to have place in Great Britain, and which seems not to be the aim of any party amongst us Let us cherish and improve our ancient government as much as possible, without encouraging a passion for such dangerous novelties.

V.—OF THE ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT.

MAN, born in a family, is compelled to maintain society, from necessity, from natural inclination, and from habit. The same creature, in his further progress, is engaged to established political society, in order to

administer justice; without which there can be no peace among them, nor safety, nor mutual intercourse. We are, therefore, to look upon all the vast apparatus of our government, as having ultimately no other object or purpose but the distribution of justice, or, in other words, the support of the twelve judges. Kings and parliaments, fleets and armies, officers of the court, and revenue ambassadors, ministers, and privy-counsellors, are all subordinate in their end to this part of administration Even the clergy, as their duty leads them to inculcate morality, may justly be thought, so far as regards this world, to have no other useful object of their institution

All men are sensible of the necessity of justice to maintain peace and order, and all men are sensible of the necessity of peace and order for the maintenance of society Yet, notwithstanding this strong and obvious necessity, such is the frailty or perverseness of our nature! it is impossible to keep men, faithfully and unerringly, in the paths of justice Some extraordinary circumstance may happen, in which a man finds his interests to be more promoted by fraud or rapine, than hurt by the breach which his injustice makes in the social union But much more frequently, he is seduced from his great and important, but distant interests, by the allurement of present, though often very frivolous temptations This great weakness is incurable in human nature

Men must, therefore, endeavour to palliate what they cannot cure. They must institute some persons under the appellation of magistrates, whose peculiar office it is to point out the decrees of equity, to punish transgressors, to correct fraud and violence, and to oblige men, however reluctant, to consult their own real and permanent interests. In a word, Obedience is a new duty which must be invented to support that of justice, and the ties of equity must be corroborated by those of allegiance to society

But still, viewing matters in an abstract light, it may be thought, that nothing is gained by this alliance, and that the factitious duty of obedience, from its very nature, has as feeble a hold of the human mind, as the primitive and natural duty of justice Peculiar interests and presents temptations may overcome the one as well as the other. They are equally exposed to the same inconvenience. And the man, who is inclined to be a bad neighbour, must be led by the same motives, well or ill understood, to be a bad citizen and subject. Not to mention, that the magistrate himself may often be negligent, or partial, or unjust in his administration.

Experience, however, proves that there is a great difference between the cases. Order in society, we find, is much better maintained by means of government, and our duty to the magistrate is more strictly guarded by the principles of human nature, than our duty to our fellow citizens. The love of dominion is so strong in the breast of man, that many not only submit to, but court all the dangers, and fatigues, and

cases of government, and men, once raised to that station, though often led astray by private passions, find, in ordinary cases, a visible interest in the impartial administration of justice The persons, who first attain this distinction by the consent, tacit or express, of the people, must be endowed with superior personal qualities of valour, force, integrity, or prudence, which command respect and confidence: and, after government is established, a regard to birth, rank, and station has a mighty influence over men, and enforces the decrees of the magistrate The prince or leader exclaims against every disorder which disturbs his society He summons all his partizans and all men of probity to aid him in correcting and redressing it and he is readily followed by all indifferent persons in the execution of his office. He soon acquires the power of rewarding these services, and in the progress of society, he establishes subordinate ministers and often a military force, who find an immediate and a visible interest in supporting his authority Habit soon consolidates what other principles of human nature had imperfectly founded, and men, once accustomed to obedience, never think of departing from that path, in which they and their ancestors have constantly trod, and to which they are confined by so many urgent and visible motives

But though this progress of human affairs may appear certain and inevitable, and though the support which allegiance brings to justice be founded on obvious principles of human nature, it cannot be expected that men should beforehand be able to discover them, or foresee their operation Government commences more casually and more imperfectly It is probable, that the first ascendant of one man over multitudes begun during a state of war, where the superiority of courage and of genius discovers itself most visibly, where unanimity and concert are most requisite, and where the pernicious effects of disorder are most sensibly felt. The long continuance of that state, an incident common among savage tribes, inured the people to submission, and if the chieftain possessed as much equity as prudence and valour, he became, even during peace, the arbiter of all differences, and could gradually, by a mixture of force and consent, establish his authority. The benefit sensibly felt from his influence, made it be cherished by the people, at least by the peaceable and well-disposed among them, and if his son enjoyed the same good qualities, government advanced the sooner to maturity and perfection, but was still in a feeble state, till the farther progress of improvement procured the magistrate a revenue, and enabled him to bestow rewards on the several instruments of his administration, and to inflict punishments on the refractory and disobedient. Before that period, each exertion of his influence must have been particular, and founded on the peculiar circumstances of the case. After it, submission was no longer a matter

of choice in the bulk of the community, but was rigorously exacted by the authority of the supreme magistrate.

In all governments, there is a perpetual intestine struggle, open or secret, between AUTHORITY and LIBERTY, and neither of them can ever absolutely prevail in the contest. A great sacrifice of liberty must necessarily be made in every government, yet even the authority, which confines liberty, can never, and perhaps ought never, in any constitution, to become quite entire and uncontroulable. The sultan is master of the life and fortune of any individual, but will not be permitted to impose new taxes on his subjects: a French monarch can impose taxes at pleasure, but would find it dangerous to attempt the lives and fortunes of individuals. Religion also, in most countries, is commonly found to be a very intractable principle, and other principles or prejudices frequently resist all the authority of the civil magistrate, whose power, being founded on opinion, can never subvert other opinions, equally rooted with that of his title to dominion. The government, which, in common appellation, receives the appellation of free, is that which admits of a partition of power among several members, whose united authority is no less, or is commonly greater, than that of any monarch, but who, in the usual course of administration, must act by general and equal laws, that are previously known to all the members, and to all their subjects. In this sense, it must be owned, that liberty is the perfection of civil society, but still authority must be acknowledged essential to its very existence: and in those contests, which so often take place between the one and the other, the latter may, on that account, challenge the preference. Unless perhaps one may say (and it may be said with some reason) that a circumstance, which is essential to the existence of civil society, must always support itself, and needs be guarded with less jealousy, than one that contributes only to its perfection, which the indolence of men is so apt to neglect, or their ignorance to overlook.

VI.—OF THE INDEPENDENCY OF PARLIAMENT.

POLITICAL writers have established it as a maxim, that, in contriving any system of government, and fixing the several checks and controuls of the constitution, every man ought to be supposed a *knave*, and to have no other end, in all his actions, than private interest. By this interest we must govern him, and, by means of it, make him, notwithstanding his insatiable avarice and ambition, co-operate to public good. Without this, say they, we shall in vain boast of the advantages of any constitution, and shall find, in the end, that we have no security for

our liberties or possessions, except the good-will of our rulers; that is, we shall have no security at all.

It is therefore, a just *political* maxim, *that every man must be supposed a knave*: though, at the same time, it appears somewhat strange, that a maxim should be true in *politics* which is false in *fact*. But to satisfy us on this head, we may consider, that men are generally more honest in their private than in their public capacity, and will go greater lengths to serve a party, than when their own private interest is alone concerned. Honour is a great check upon mankind: but where a considerable body of men act together, this check is in a great measure removed; since a man is sure to be approved of by his own party, for what promotes the common interest; and he soons learns to despise the clamours of adversaries. To which we may add, that every court or senate is determined by the greater number of voices; so that, if self-interest influences only the majority (as it will always do), the whole senate follows the allurements of this separate interest, and acts as if it contained not one member who had any regard to public interest and liberty.

When there offers, therefore, to our censure and examination, any plan of government, real or imaginary, where the power is distributed among several courts, and several orders of men, we should always consider the separate interest of each court, and each order; and, if we find that by the skilful division of power, this interest must necessarily, in its operation, concur with the public, we may pronounce that government to be wise and happy. If on the contrary separate interest be not checked, and be not directed to the public we ought to look for nothing but faction, disorder, and tyranny from such a government. In this opinion I am justified by experience as well as by the authority of all philosophers and politicians, both ancient and modern.

How much, therefore, would it have surprised such a genius as Cicero or Tacitus, to have been told, that, in a future age, there should arise a very regular system of *mixed* government, where the authority was so distributed, that one rank, whenever it pleased, might swallow up all the rest, and engross the whole power of the constitution. Such a government, they would say, will not be a mixed government. For so great is the natural ambition of men that they are never satisfied with power; and if one order of men, by pursuing its own interest, can usurp upon every other order, it will certainly do so, and render itself, as far as possible, absolute and uncontroulable.

But, in this opinion, experience shews they would have been mistaken. For this is actually the case with the British constitution. The share of power, allotted by our constitution to the house of commons, is so great, that it absolutely commands all the other parts of the government. The king's legislative power is plainly no proper check to it. For though the king has a negative in framing laws, yet this, in

fact, is esteemed of so little moment, that whatever is voted by the two houses, is always sure to pass into a law, and the royal assent is little better than a form The principal weight of the crown lies in the executive power; but besides that, the executive power in every government is altogether subordinate to the legislative; besides this, I say, the exercise of this power requires an immense expense, and the commons have assumed to themselves the sole right of granting money How, easy, therefore, would it be for that house to wrest from the crown all these powers, one after another, by making every grant conditional, and choosing their time so well, that their refusal of supply should only distress the government, without giving foreign powers any advantage over us? Did the house of commons depend in the same manner upon the king, and had none of the members any property but from his gift, would not he command all their resolutions, and be from that moment absolute? As to the house of lords, they are a very powerful support to the crown, so long as they are, in their turn, supported by it, but both experience and reason shew, that they have no force or authority sufficient to maintain themselves alone, without such support

How, therefore, shall we solve this paradox? And by what means is this member of our constitution confined within the proper limits, since, from our very constitution, it must necessarily have as much power as it demands, and can only be confined by itself? How is this consistent with our experience of human nature? I answer, that the interest of the body is here restrained by that of the individuals, and that the house of commons stretches not its power, because such an usurpation would be contrary to the interest of the majority of its members The crown has so many offices at its disposal, that, when assisted by the honest and disinterested part of the house, it will always command the resolutions of the whole, so far, at least, as to preserve the ancient constitution from danger We may, therefore, give to this influence what name we please we may call it by the invidious appellations of *corruption* and *dependence*, but some degree and some kind of it are inseparable from the very nature of the constitution, and necessary to the preservation of our mixed government.

Instead, then, of asserting* absolutely, that the dependence of parliament, in every degree, is an infringement of British liberty, the country-party should have made some concessions to their adversaries, and have only examined what was the proper degree of this dependence, beyond which it became dangerous to liberty But such a moderation is not to be expected in party-men of any kind. After a concession of this nature, all declamation must be abandoned; and a calm inquiry* into the proper degree of court-influence and parlia-

* See "Dissertation on Parties."

mentary dependence would have been expected by the readers. And though the advantage, in such a controversy, might possibly remain to the *country-party*; yet the victory would not be so complete as they wish for, nor would a true patriot have given an entire loose to his zeal, for fear of running matters into a contrary extreme, by diminishing too* far the influence of the crown. It was, therefore, thought best to deny, that this extreme could ever be dangerous to the constitution, or that the crown could ever have too little influence over members of parliament.

All questions concerning the proper medium between extremes are difficult to be decided, both because it is not easy to find *words* proper to fix this medium, and because the good and ill, in such cases, run so gradually into each other, as even to render our *sentiments* doubtful and uncertain. But there is a peculiar difficulty in the present case, which would embarrass the most knowing and most impartial examiner. The power of the crown is always lodged in a single person, either king or minister, and as this person may have either a greater or less degree of ambition, capacity, courage, popularity, or fortune, the power, which is too great in one hand, may become too little in another. In pure republics, where the authority is distributed among several assemblies or senates, the checks and controuls are more regular in their operation, because the members of such numerous assemblies may be presumed to be always nearly equal in capacity and virtue, and it is only their number, riches, or authority, which enter into consideration. But a limited monarchy admits not of any such stability, nor is it possible to assign to the crown such a determinate degree of power, as will, in every hand, form a proper counterbalance to the other parts of the constitution. This is an unavoidable disadvantage, among the many advantages, attending that species of government.

VII.—WHETHER THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT INCLINES MORE TO ABSOLUTE MONARCHY, OR TO A REPUBLIC?

It affords a violent prejudice against almost every science, that no prudent man, however sure of his principles, dares prophesy concerning any event, or foretel the remote consequences of things. A physician will not venture to pronounce concerning the condition of

* By that *influence of the crown*, which I would justify, I mean only that which arises from the offices and honours that are at the disposal of the crown. As to private *bribery*, it may be considered in the same light as the practice of employing spies, which is scarcely justifiable in a good minister, and is infamous in a bad one. But to be a spy, or to be corrupted, is always infamous under all ministers, and is to be regarded as a shameless prostitution. Polybius justly esteems the pecuniary influence of the senate and censors to be one of the regular and constitutional weights which preserved the balance of the Roman government. Lib. vi. [illegible]

his patient a fortnight or a month after: and still less dares a politician foretel the situation of public affairs a few years hence. Harrington thought himself so sure of his general principle, *that the balance of power depends on that of property*, that he ventured to pronounce it impossible ever to re-establish monarchy in England but his book was scarcely published when the king was restored, and we see, that monarchy has ever since subsisted upon the same footing as before. Notwithstanding this unlucky example, I will venture to examine an important question, to wit, *whether the British government inclines more to absolute monarchy, or to a republic, and in which of these two species of government it will most probably terminate?* As there seems not to be any great danger of a sudden revolution either way, I shall at least escape the shame attending my temerity, if I should be found to have been mistaken

Those who assert, that the balance of our government inclines towards absolute monarchy, may support their opinion by the following reasons that property has a great influence on power cannot possibly be denied, but yet the general maxim, *that the balance of one depends on the balance of the other*, must be received with several limitations. It is evident, that much less property in a single hand will be able to counterbalance a greater property in several, not only because it is difficult to make many persons combine in the same views and measures, but because property, when united, causes much greater dependence, than the same property, when dispersed A hundred persons, of £1,000 a-year a-piece, can consume all their income, and nobody shall ever be the better for them, except their servants and tradesmen, who justly regard their profits as the product of their own labour But a man possessed of £100,000 a-year, if he has either any generosity, or any cunning, may create a great dependence by obligations, and still a greater by expectations Hence we may observe, that, in all free governments, any subject exorbitantly rich has always created jealousy, even though his riches bore no proportion to those of the state Crassus's fortune, if I remember well, amounted only to about two millions and a half of our money, yet we find, that though his genius was nothing extraordinary, he was able, by means of his riches alone, to counterbalance, during his lifetime, the power of Pompey as well as that of Cæsar, who afterwards became master of the world. The wealth of the Medici made them masters of Florence, though, it is probable, it was not considerable, compared to the united property of that opulent republic.

These considerations are apt to make one entertain a magnificent idea of the British spirit and love of liberty, since we could maintain our free government, during so many centuries, against our sovereigns, who, besides the power, and dignity, and majesty of the crown, have always been possessed of much more property, than any subject has

ever enjoyed in any commonwealth. But it may be said, that this spirit, however great, will never be able to support itself against that immense property, which is now lodged in the king, and which is still increasing Upon a moderate computation, there are near three millions a year at the disposal of the crown The civil list amounts to near a million, the collection of all taxes to another, and the employments in the army and navy, together with ecclesiastical preferments, to above a third million an enormous sum, and what may fairly be computed to be more than a thirtieth part of the whole income and labour of the kingdom When we add to this great property, the increasing luxury of the nation, our proneness to corruption, together with the great power and prerogatives of the crown, and the command of military force, there is no one but must despair of being able, without extraordinary efforts, to support our free government much longer under these disadvantages

On the other hand, those who maintain, that the bias of the British government leans towards a republic, may support their opinion by specious arguments It may be said, that, though this immense property in the crown be joined to the dignity of first magistrate, and to many other legal powers and prerogatives, which should naturally give it greater influence, yet it really becomes less dangerous to liberty upon that very account Were England a republic, and were any private man possessed of a revenue, a third, or even a tenth part as large as that of the crown he would very justly excite jealousy, because he would infallibly have great authority in the government And such an irregular authority, not avowed by the laws, is always more dangerous than a much greater authority, derived from them A man possessed of usurped power, can set no bounds to his pretensions his partizans have liberty to hope for every thing in his favour his enemies provoke his ambition with his fears, by the violence of their opposition and the government being thrown into a ferment, every corrupted humour in the state naturally gathers to him On the contrary, a legal authority, though great, has always some bounds which terminate both the hopes and pretensions of the person possessed of it the laws must have provided a remedy against its excesses such an eminent magistrate has much to fear, and little to hope from his usurpations. and as his legal authority is quietly submitted to, he has small temptation and small opportunity of extending it farther Besides, it happens, with regard to ambitious aims and projects, what may be observed with regard to sects of philosophy and religion. A new sect excites such a ferment, and is both opposed and defended with such vehemence, that always spreads faster, and multiplies its partizans with greater rapidity, than any old established opinion, recommended by the sanction of the laws and of antiquity Such is the nature of novelty, that, when any thing pleases, it becomes doubly agreeable, if new; but if

it displeases, it is doubly displeasing, upon that very account. And, in most cases, the violence of enemies is favourable to ambitious projects, as well as the zeal of partizans.

It may farther be said, that, though men be much governed by interest, yet even interest itself, and all human affairs, are entirely governed by *opinion* Now, there has been a sudden sensible change in the opinions of men within these last fifty years, by the progress of learning and of liberty Most people, in this island, have divested themselves of all superstitious reverence to names and authority the clergy have much lost their credit Their doctrines have been ridiculed, and even religion can scarcely support itself in the world. The mere name of *king* commands little respect, and to talk of a king as GOD's vicegerent on earth, or to give him any of those magnificent titles, which formerly dazzled mankind, would but excite laughter in every one Though the crown, by means of its large revenue, may maintains its authority, in times of tranquility, upon private interest and influence yet, as the least shock or convulsion must break all these interests to pieces, the royal power, being no longer supported by the settled principles and opinions of men, will immediately dissolve Had men been in the disposition at the *revolution*, as they are at present, monarchy would have run a great risk of being entirely lost in this island

Durst I venture to deliver my own sentiments amidst these opposite arguments, I would assert, that, unless there happen some extraordinary convulsion, the power of the crown, by means of its large revenue, is rather upon the increase, though at the same time I own, that its progress seems very slow, and almost insensible The tide which has run long and with some rapidity, to the side of popular government, is just beginning to turn towards monarchy

It is well known, that every government must come to a period, and that death is unavoidable to the political as well as to the animal body But, as one kind of death may be preferable to another, it may be inquired, whether it be more desirable for the British constitution to terminate in a popular government, or in an absolute monarchy? Here I would frankly declare, that, though liberty be preferable to slavery, in almost every case, yet I should rather wish to see an absolute monarch than a republic in this island. For let us consider what kind of republic we have reason to expect. The question is not concerning any fine imaginary republic, of which a man may form a plan in his closet. There is no doubt, but a popular government may be imagined more perfect than absolute monarchy, or even than our present constitution. But what reason have we to expect that any such government will ever be established in Great Britain, upon the dissolution of our monarchy? If any single person acquire power enough to take our constitution to pieces, and [illegible]

up anew, he is really an absolute monarch; and we have already had an instance of this kind, sufficient to convince us, that such a person will never resign his power, or establish any free government. Matters, therefore, must be trusted to their natural progress and operation, and the house of commons, according to its present constitution, must be the only legislature in such a popular government. The inconveniences attending such a situation of affairs, present themselves by thousands. If the house of commons, in such a case, ever dissolve itself, which is not to be expected, we may look for a civil war every election. If it continue itself, we shall suffer all the tyranny of a faction subdivided into new factions. And, as such a violent government cannot long subsist, we shall, at last, after many convulsions and civil wars, find repose in absolute monarchy, which it would have been happier for us to have established peaceably from the beginning. Absolute monarchy, therefore, is the easiest death, the true *Euthanasia* of the British constitution.

Thus, if we have reason to be more jealous of monarchy, because the danger is imminent from that quarter, we have also reason to be more jealous of popular government, because that danger is more terrible. This may teach us lessons of moderation in all our political controversies.

VIII.—OF PARTIES IN GENERAL.

Of all men, that distinguish themselves by memorable achievements, the first place of honour seems due to LEGISLATORS and founders of states, who transmit a system of laws and institutions to secure the peace, happiness, and liberty of future generations. The influence of useful inventions in the arts and sciences may, perhaps, extend farther than that of wise laws, whose effects are limited both in time and place; but the benefit arising from the former, is not so sensible as that which results from the latter. Speculative sciences do, indeed, improve the mind; but this advantage reaches only to a few persons, who have leisure to apply themselves to them. And as to practical arts, which increase the commodities and enjoyments of life, it is well known, that men's happiness consists not so much in an abundance of these, as in the peace and security with which they possess them; and those blessings can only be derived from good government. Not to mention, that general virtue and good morals in a state, which are so requisite to happiness, can never arise from the most refined precepts of philosophy, or even the severest injunctions of religion; but must proceed entirely from the virtuous education of youth, the effect of wise laws and institutions. I must, therefore, presume to differ from Lord

Bacon in this particular, and must regard antiquity as somewhat unjust in its distribution of honour, when it made gods of all the inventors of useful arts, such as Ceres, Bacchus, Æsculapius and dignify legislators, such as Romulus and Theseus, only with the appellation of demigods and heroes

As much as legislators and founders of states ought to be honoured and respected among men, as much ought the founders of sects and factions to be detested and hated, because the influence of faction is directly contrary to that of laws. Factions subvert government, render laws impotent, and beget the fiercest animosities among men of the same nation, who ought to give mutual assistance and protection to each other And what should render the founder of parties more odious, is the difficulty of extirpating these weeds, when once they have taken root in any state They naturally propagate themselves for many centuries, and seldom end but by the total dissolution of that government, in which they are sown They are, besides, plants which grow most plentifully in the richest soil, and though absolute governments be not wholly free from them, it must be confessed, that they rise more easily, and propagate themselves faster in free governments, where they always infect the legislature itself, which alone could be able, by the steady application of rewards and punishments, to eradicate them

Factions may be divided into Personal and Real, that is, into factions founded on personal friendship or animosity among such as compose the contending parties, and into those founded on some real difference of sentiment or interest The reason of this distinction is obvious, though I must acknowledge, that parties are seldom found pure and unmixed, either of the one kind or the other It is not often seen, that a government divides into factions, where there is no difference in the views of the constituent members, either real or apparent, trivial or material and in those factions, which are founded on the most real and most material difference, there is always observed a great deal of personal animosity or affection. But notwithstanding this mixture, a party may be denominated either personal or real, according to that principle which is predominated, and is found to have the greatest influence.

Personal factions arise most easily in small republics. Every domestic quarrel, there, becomes an affair of state Love, vanity, emulation, any passion, as well as ambition and resentment, begets public division. The NERI and BIANCHI of Florence, the FREGOSI and ADORNI of Genoa, the COLONESI and ORSINI of modern Rome, were parties of this kind

Men have such a propensity to divide into personal factions, that the smallest appearance of real difference will produce them. What can be imagined more trivial than the difference between one colour of

livery and another in horse-races? Yet this difference begat two most inveterate factions in the Greek empire, the PRASINI and VENETI, who never suspended their animosities till they ruined that unhappy government.

We find in the Roman history a remarkable dissension between two tribes, the POLLIA and PAPIRIA, which continued for the space of near three hundred years, and discovered itself in their suffrages at every election of magistrates* This faction was the more remarkable, as it could continue for so long a tract of time, even though it did not spread itself, nor draw any of the other tribes into a share of the quarrel. If mankind had not a strong propensity to such divisions, the indifference of the rest of the community must have suppressed this foolish animosity, that had not any aliment of new benefits and injuries, of general sympathy and antipathy, which never fail to take place, when the whole state is rent into two equal factions.

Nothing is more usual than to see parties, which have begun upon a real difference, continue even after that difference is lost When men are once enlisted on opposite sides, they contract an affection to the persons with whom they are united, and an animosity against their antagonists and these passions they often transmit to their posterity The real difference between Guelf and Ghibbelline was long lost in Italy, before these factions were extinguished. The Guelfs adhered to the Pope, the Ghibbellines to the emperor, yet the family of Sforza, who were in alliance with the emperor, though they were Guelfs, being expelled Milan by the king [Lewis XII] of France, assisted by Jacomo Trivulzio and the Ghibbellines, the pope concurred with the latter, and they formed leagues with the pope against the emperor

The civil wars which arose some few years ago in Morocco, between the *blacks* and *whites*, merely on account of their complexion, are founded on a pleasant difference We laugh at them, but I believe were things rightly examined, we afford much more occasion of ridicule to the Moors For, what are all the wars of religion, which have prevailed in this polite and knowing part of the world? They are certainly more absurd than the Moorish civil wars. The difference of complexion is a sensible and a real difference but the controversy about an article of faith, which is unintelligible, is not a difference in sentiment, but in a few phrases and expressions, which one party accepts

* As this fact has not been much observed by antiquaries or politicians, I shall deliver it in the words of the Roman historian. 'Populus Tusculanus cum conjugibus ac liberis Romam venit Ea multitudo veste mutata, et specie reorum, tribus circuit genibus se omnium advolvens. Plus itaque misericordia ad pœnæ veniam impetrandam quam causa ad crimen purgandum valuit Tribus omnes, præter Polliam, antiquarunt legem Polliæ sententia fuit, puberes verberatos necari liberos conjugesque sub corona lege belli venire Memoriamque ejus iræ Tusculanis in pœnæ tam atrocis auctores mansisse ad patris ætatem constat, nec quemquam fere ex Pollia tribu candidatum Papiram ferre solitam. T Livii, lib. 8. The CASTELANI and NICOLLOTI are two mobbish factions in Venice, who frequently box together, and then lay aside their quarrels presently

of, without understanding them, and the other refuses in the same manner

Real factions may be divided into those from *interest*, from *principle*, and from *affection* Of all factions, the first are the most reasonable, and the most excusable. Where two orders of men, such as the nobles and people, have a distinct authority in a government, not very accurately balanced and modelled, they naturally follow a distinct interest; nor can we reasonably expect a different conduct, considering that degree of selfishness implanted in human nature. It requires great skill in a legislator to prevent such parties, and many philosophers are of opinion, that this secret, like the *grand elixir*, or *perpetual motion*, may amuse men in theory, but can never possibly be reduced to practice. In despotic governments, indeed, factions often do not appear, but they are not the less real, or rather, they are more real and more pernicious, upon that very account The distinct orders of men, nobles and people, soldiers and merchants, have all a distinct interest, but the more powerful oppresses the weaker with impunity, and without resistance, which begets a seeming tranquility in such governments

There has been an attempt in England to divide the *landed* and *trading* part of the nation, but without success The interests of these two bodies are not really distinct, and never will be so, till our public debts increase to such a degree, as to become altogether oppressive and intolerable.

Parties from *principle*, especially abstract speculative principle, are known only to modern times, and are, perhaps, the most extraordinary and unaccountable *phenomenon* that has yet appeared in human affairs. Where different principles beget a contrariety of conduct, which is the case with all different political principles, the matter may be more easily explained A man, who esteems the true right of government to lie in one man, or one family, cannot easily agree with his fellow-citizen, who thinks that another man or family is possessed of this right Each naturally wishes that right may take place, according to his own notions of it. But where the difference of principle is attended with no contrariety of action, but every one may follow his own way, without interfering with his neighbour, as happens in all religious controversies, what madness, what fury, can beget such an unhappy and such fatal divisions?

Two men travelling on the highway, the one east, the other west, can easily pass each other, if the way be broad enough, but two men, reasoning upon opposite principles of religion, cannot so easily pass, without shocking, though one should think, that the way were also, in that case, sufficiently broad, and that each might proceed, without interruption, in his own course. But such is the nature of the human mind, that it always lays hold on every mind that approaches it; and

as it is wonderfully fortified by an unanimity of sentiments, so it is shocked and disturbed by any contrariety. Hence the eagerness which most people discover in a dispute; and hence their impatience of opposition, even in the most speculative and indifferent opinions.

This principle, however frivolous it may appear, seems to have been the origin of all religious wars and divisions. But as this principle is universal in human nature, its effects would not have been confined to one age, and to raise one sect of religion, did it not there concur with other more accidental causes, which raise it to such a height, as to produce the greatest misery and devastation. Most religions of the ancient world arose in the unknown ages of government, when men were as yet barbarous and uninstructed, and the prince, as well as peasant, was disposed to receive, with implicit faith, every pious tale or fiction, which was offered him. The magistrate embraced the religion of the people, and, entering cordially into the care of sacred matters, naturally acquired an authority in them and united the ecclesiastical with the civil power. But the *Christian* religion, arising while the principles directly opposite to it were firmly established in the polite part of the world, who depised the nation that first broached this novelty; no wonder, that, in such circumstances, it was but little countenanced by the civil magistrate, and that the priesthood was allowed to engross all the authority in the new sect. So bad a use did they make of this power, even in those early times, that the primitive persecution may, perhaps, *in part**, be ascribed to the violence instilled by the priests into their followers.

And the same principles of priestly government continuing, after Christianity became the established religion, they have engendered a spirit of persecution, which has ever since been the poison of human society, and the source of the most inveterate factions in every government. Such divisions, therefore, on the part of the people, may justly be esteemed factions of *principle*; but, on the part of the priests, who are the prime movers, they are really factions of *interest*.

There is another cause (beside the authority of the priests, and the separation of the ecclesiastical and civil powers) which has contributed

* I say, *in part*; for it is a vulgar error to imagine, that the ancients were as great friends to toleration as the English or Dutch are at present. The laws against external superstition, among the Romans, were as ancient as the time of the twelve tables; and the Jews, as well as Christians, were sometimes punished by them; though in general these laws were not rigorously executed. Immediately after the conquest of Gaul, they forbade all but the natives to be initiated into the religion of the Druids; and this was a kind of persecution. In about a century after this conquest, the emperor Claudius quite abolished that superstition by penal laws; which would have been a very grievous persecution, if the imitation of the Roman manners had not, before-hand, weaned the Gauls from their ancient prejudices. Suetonius in vita Claudii. Pliny ascribes the abolition of the Druidical superstitions to Tiberius, probably because that emperor had taken some steps towards restraining them (lib. xxx. cap. 1.). This is an instance of the usual caution and moderation of the Romans in such cases; and very different from their violent and sanguinary method of treating the Christians. Hence we may entertain a suspicion, that those furious persecutions of *Christianity* were in some measure owing to the imprudent zeal and bigotry of the first propagators of that sect; and Ecclesiastical history affords us many reasons to confirm this suspicion.

to render Christendom the scene of religious wars and divisions Religions, that arise in ages totally ignorant and barbarous, consist mostly of traditional tales and fictions, which may be different in every sect, without being contrary to each other and even when they are contrary, every one adheres to the tradition of his own sect, without much reasoning or disputation But as philosophy was widely spread over the world, at the time when Christianity arose, the teachers of the new sect were obliged to form a system of speculative opinions, to divide, with some accuracy, their articles of faith, and to explain, comment, confute, and defend with all the subtlety of argument and science Hence naturally arose keenness in dispute, when the Christian religion came to be split into divisions and heresies Sects of philosophy, in the ancient world, were more zealous than parties of religion, but, in modern times, parties of religion are more furious and enraged than the most cruel factions that ever arose from interest and ambition

I have mentioned parties from *affection* as a kind of *real* parties, besides those from *interest* and principle By parties from affection, I understand those which are founded on the different attachments of men towards particular families and persons, whom they desire to rule over them These factions are often very violent, though I must own, it may seem unaccountable, that men should attach themselves so strongly to persons, with whom they are nowise acquainted, whom perhaps they never saw, and from whom they never received, nor can ever hope for, any favour Yet this we often find to be the case, and even with men, who, on other occasions, discover no great generosity of spirit, nor are found to be easily transported by friendship beyond their own interest We are apt to think the relation between us and our sovereign very close and intimate The splendour of majesty and power bestows an importance on the fortunes even of a single person And when a man's good-nature does not give him this imaginary interest, his ill-nature will, from spite and opposition to persons whose sentiments are different from his own

IX.—OF THE PARTIES OF GREAT BRITAIN,

WERE the British government proposed as a subject of speculation, one would immediately perceive in it a source of division and party, which it would be almost impossible for it, under any administration to avoid. The just balance between the republican and monarchical part of our constitution is really, in itself, so extremely delicate and uncertain, that, when joined to men's passions and prejudices, it is im-

possible but different opinions must arise concerning it, even among persons of the best understanding. Those of mild tempers, who love peace and order, and detest sedition and civil wars, will always entertain more favourable sentiments of monarchy than men of bold and generous spirits, who are passionate lovers of liberty, and think no evil comparable to subjection and slavery. And though all reasonable men agree in general to preserve our mixed government, yet, when they come to particulars, some will incline to trust greater powers to the crown, to bestow on it more influence, and to guard against its encroachments with less caution, than others who are terrified at the most distant approaches of tyranny and despotic power. Thus are there parties of PRINCIPLE involved in the very nature of our constitution, which may properly enough be denominated those of COURT and COUNTRY. The strength and violence of each of these parties will much depend upon the particular administration. An administration may be so bad, as to throw a great majority into the opposition; as a good administration will reconcile to the court many of the most passionate lovers of liberty. But however the nation may fluctuate between them, the parties themselves will always subsist, so long as we are governed by a limited monarchy.

But, besides this difference of *Principle*, those parties are very much fomented by a difference of INTEREST, without which they could scarcely ever be dangerous or violent. The crown will naturally bestow all trust and power upon those, whose principles, real or pretended, are most favourable to monarchical government; and this temptation will naturally engage them to go greater lengths than their principles would otherwise carry them. Their antagonists, who are disappointed in their ambitious aims, throw themselves into the party whose sentiments incline them to be most jealous of royal power, and naturally carry those sentiments to a greater height than sound politics will justify. Thus *Court* and *Country*, which are the genuine offspring of the British government, are a kind of mixed parties, and are influenced both by principle and by interest. The heads of the factions are commonly most governed by the latter motive; the inferior members of them by the former.

In such a constitution as that of Great Britain, the established clergy, while things are in their natural situation, will always be of a *Court*-party; as, on the contrary, dissenters of all kinds will be of the *Country*-party; since they can never hope for that toleration, which they stand in need of, but by means of our free government. All princes, that have aimed at despotic power, have known of what importance it was to gain the established clergy. As the clergy, on their part, have shewn a great facility in entering into the views of such princes.* Gustavus Vasa was, perhaps, the only ambitious

* Judaei sibi ipsi reges imposuere; qui mobilitate vulgi expulsi, resumpta per arma dominatione; fugas civium, urbium eversiones, fratrum, conjugum, parentum neces, aliaque solit

monarch that ever depressed the church, at the same time that he discouraged liberty. But the exorbitant power of the bishops in Sweden, who, at that time, overtopped the crown itself, together with their attachment to a foreign family, was the reason of his embracing such an unusual system of politics.

This observation, concerning the propensity of priests to the government of a single person, is not true with regard to one sect only. The *Presbyterian* and *Calvinistic* clergy in Holland were professed friends to the family of Orange; as the *Arminians*, who were esteemed heretics, were of the Louvestein faction, and zealous for liberty. But if a prince have the choice of both, it is easy to see that he will prefer the episcopal to the presbyterian form of government, both because of the greater affinity between monarchy and episcopacy, and because of the facility which he will find, in such a government, of ruling, the clergy by means of their ecclesiastical superiors.*

If we consider the first rise of parties in England, during the great rebellion, we shall observe that it was conformable to this general theory, and that the species of government gave birth to them by a regular and infallible operation. The English constitution, before that period, had lain in a kind of confusion; yet so as that the subjects possessed many noble privileges, which, though not exactly bounded and secured by law, were universally deemed, from long possession, to belong to them as their birth-right. An ambitious, or rather a misguided, prince arose, who deemed all these privileges to be concessions of his predecessors, revocable at pleasure; and in prosecution of this principle, he openly acted in violation of liberty during the course of several years. Necessity, at last, constrained him to call a parliament: the spirit of liberty arose and spread itself: the prince, being without any support, was obliged to grant everything required of him: and his enemies, jealous and implacable, set no bounds to their pretensions. Here, then, began those contests, in which it was no wonder that men of that age were divided into different parties; since, even at this day, the impartial are at a loss to decide concerning the justice of the quarrel. The pretensions of the parliament, if yielded to, broke the balance of the constitution, by rendering the government almost entirely republican. If not yielded to, the nation was, perhaps, still in danger of absolute power, from the settled principles and inveterate habits of the King, which had plainly appeared in every concession that he had been constrained to make to his people. In this question, so delicate and uncertain, men naturally fell to the side which was most conformable to their usual principles; and the more passionate favourers of monarchy declared for the king, as the zealous friends of liberty sided with the parliament. The hopes of success being nearly

regibus suis, superstitionem fovebant: quia honor sacerdotii firmamentum potentiæ assumebatur.—Tacit. Hist. lib. v.

* Populi imperium juxta libertatem: paucorum dominatio regiæ libidini proprior est.—Tacit. Ann. lib. vi.

equal on both sides, *interest* had no general influence in this contest so that ROUNDHEAD and CAVALIER were merely parties of principle; neither of which disowned either monarchy or liberty, but the former party inclined most to the republican part of our government, the latter to the monarchical In this respect, they may be considered as court and country party, inflamed into a civil war, by an unhappy concurrence of circumstances, and by the turbulent spirit of the age. The commonwealth's men, and the partizans of absolute power, lay concealed in both parties, and were but an inconsiderable part of them

The clergy had concurred with the king's arbitrary designs and, in return, were allowed to persecute their adversaries, whom they called heretics and schismatics, The established clergy were episcopal, the non-conformists presbyterian so that all things occurred to throw the former, without reserve, into the king's party, and the latter into that of the parliament.

Every one knows the event of this quarrel, fatal to the king first, to the parliament afterwards After many confusions and revolutions, the royal family was at last restored, and the ancient government re-established Charles II was not made wiser by the example of his father, but prosecuted the same measures, though, at first, with more secrecy and caution New parties arose, under the appellation of *Whig* and *Tory*, which have continued ever since to confound and distract our government To determine the nature of these parties is perhaps one of the most difficult problems that can be met with, and is a proof that history may contain questions as uncertain as any to be found in the most abstract sciences We have seen the conduct of the two parties, during the course of seventy years, in a vast variety of circumstances, possessed of power, and deprived of it, during peace, and during war persons, who profess themselves of one side or other, we meet with every hour, in company, in our pleasures, in our serious occupations we ourselves are constrained, in a manner, to take party, and living in a country of the highest liberty, every one may openly declare all his sentiments and opinions yet are we at a loss to tell the nature, pretensions, and principles, of the different factions.

When we compare the parties of WHIG and TORY with those of ROUND-HEAD and CAVALIER, the most obvious difference that appears between them consists in the principles of *passive obedience*, and *indefeasible right*, which were but little heard of among the Cavaliers, but became the universal doctrine, and were esteemed the true characteristic of a Tory. Were these principles pushed into their most obvious consequences, they imply a formal renunciation of all our liberties, and an avowal of absolute monarchy, since nothing can be a greater absurdity than a limited power, which must not be resisted, even when it exceeds its limitations. But, as the most rational principles are often but a weak counterpoise to passion, it is no wonder that these

absurd principles were found too weak for that effect The Tories, as men, were enemies to oppression, and also as Englishmen, they were enemies to arbitrary power Their zeal for liberty was, perhaps, less fervent than that of their antagonists, but was sufficient to make them forget all their general principles, when they saw themselves openly threatened with a subversion of the ancient government From these sentiments arose the *revolution*, an event of mighty consequence, and the firmest foundation of British liberty The conduct of the Tories, during that event, and after it, will afford us a true insight into the nature of that party

I They appear to have had the genuine sentiments of Britons in their affection for liberty, and in their determined resolution not to sacrifice it to any abstract principle whatsoever, or to any imaginary rights of princes This part of their character might justly have been doubted of before the *revolution*, from the obvious tendency of their avowed principles, and from their compliances with the court, which seemed to make little secret of its arbitrary design The *revolution* shewed them to have been, in this respect, nothing but a genuine *court-party*, such as might be expected in a British government, that is, *Lovers of liberty but greater lovers of monarchy* It must, however, be confessed, that they carried their monarchical principles farther even in practice, but more so in theory, than was, in any degree, consistent with a limited government

II Neither their principles nor affections concurred, entirely or heartily, with the settlement made at the *Revolution*, or with that which has since taken place This part of their character may seem opposite to the former, since any other settlement, in those circumstances of the nation, must probably have been dangerous, if not fatal to liberty But the heart of man is made to reconcile contradictions, and this contradiction is not greater than that between *passive obedience*, and the *resistance* employed at the revolution A TORY, therefore, since the *revolution*, may be defined in a few words, to be *a lover of monarchy, though without abandoning liberty, and a partisan of the family of Stuart* As a WHIG may be defined to be *a lover of liberty, though without renouncing monarchy and a friend to the settlement in the Protestant line*

These different views, with regard to the settlement of the crown, were accidental, but natural additions to the principles of the *court* and *country* parties, which are the genuine divisions in the British government A passionate lover of monarchy is apt to be displeased at any change of the succession, as savouring too much of a commonwealth a passionate lover of liberty is apt to think that every part of the government ought to be subordinate to the interests of liberty

Some, who will not venture to assert, that the *real* difference between Whig and Tory was lost at the *revolution*, seem inclined to think, that

the difference is now abolished, and that affairs are so far returned to their natural state, that there are at present no other parties among us but *court* and *country*, that is, men who, by interest or principle, are attached either to monarchy or liberty The Tories have been so long obliged to talk in the republican style, that they seem to have made converts of themselves by their hypocrisy, and to have embraced the sentiments, as well as language, of their adversaries There are, however, very considerable remains of that party in England, with all their old prejudices, and a proof that *court* and *country* are not our only parties, is, that almost all the dissenters side with the court, and the lower clergy, at least of the church of England, with the opposition This may convince us that some bias still hangs upon our constitution, some extrinsic weight, which turns it from its natural course, and causes a confusion in our parties*

X.—OF THE DIGNITY OR MEANNESS OF HUMAN NATURE

THERE are certain sects which secretly form themselves in the learned world, as well as factions in the political, and though sometimes, they come not to an open rupture, they give a different turn to the ways of thinking of those who have taken part on either side The most remarkable of this kind are the sects founded on the different sentiments with regard to the *dignity of human nature*, which is a point that seems to have divided philosophers and poets as well as divines, from the beginning of the world to this day Some exalt our species to the skies, and represent man as a kind of human demigod, who derives his origin from heaven, and retains evident marks of his lineage and descent. Others insist upon the blind sides of human nature, and can discover nothing, except vanity, in which man surpasses the other animals, whom he affects so much to despise If an author possess the talent of rhetoric and declamation, he commonly takes part with the former if his turn lie towards irony and ridicule, he naturally throws himself into the other extreme

I am far from thinking, that all those, who have depreciated our species, have been enemies to virtue and have exposed the frailties of their fellow creatures with any bad intention On the contrary, I am

*Some of the opinions delivered in these Essays, with regard to the public transactions in the last century, the Author on more accurate examination found reason to retract in his *History of Great Britain* And as he would not enslave himself to the systems of either party, neither would he fetter his judgment by his own preconceived opinions and principles, nor is he ashamed to acknowledge his mistakes. These mistakes were indeed, at that time, almost universal in this kingdom.

sensible that a delicate sense of morals, especially when attended with a splenetic temper, is apt to give a man a disgust of the world, and to make him consider the common course of human affairs with too much indignation. I must, however, be of opinion, that the sentiments of those, who are inclined to think favourably of mankind, are more advantageous to virtue, than the contrary principles, which give us a mean opinion of our nature When a man is prepossessed with a high notion of his rank and character in the creation, he will naturally endeavour to act up to it, and will scorn to do a base or vicious action, which might sink him below that figure which he makes in his own imagination. Accordingly we find, that all cur polite and fashionable moralists insist upon this topic, and endeavour to represent vice as unworthy of man, as well as odious in itself

We find few disputes, that are not founded on some ambiguity in the expression , and I am persuaded, that the present dispute, concerning the dignity or meanness of human nature, is not more exempt from it than any other It may, therefore, be worth while to consider, what is real, and what is only verbal, in this controversy

That there is a natural difference between merit and demerit, virtue and vice, wisdom and folly, no reasonable man will deny yet it is evident, that in affixing the term, which denotes either our approbation or blame, we are commonly more influenced by comparison than by any fixed unalterable standard in the nature of things In like manner, quantity, and extension, and bulk, are by every one acknowledged to be real things but when we call any animal *great* or *little*, we always form a secret comparison between that animal and others of the same species , and it is that comparison which regulates our judgment concerning its greatness A dog and a horse may be of the very same size, while the one is admired for the greatness of its bulk, and the other for the smallness When I am present, therefore, at any dispute, I always consider with myself, whether it be a question of comparison or not that is the subject of the controversy , and if it be, whether the disputants compare the same objects together, or talk of things that are widely different

In forming our notions of human nature, we are apt to make a comparison between men and animals, the only creatures endowed with thought that fall under our senses Certainly this comparison is favourable to mankind On the one hand, we see a creature, whose thoughts are not limited by any narrow bounds, either of place or time, who carries his researches into the most distant regions of this globe, and beyond this globe, to the planets and heavenly bodies ; looks backward to consider the first origin, at least, the history of the human race , casts his eye forward to see the influence of his action upon posterity, and the judgments which will be formed of his character a thousand years hence ; a creature, who traces causes and effects to a

great length and intricacy; extracts general principles from particular appearances, improves upon his discoveries, corrects his mistakes, and makes his very errors profitable. On the other hand, we are presented with a creature the very reverse of this, limited in its observations and reasonings to a few sensible objects which surround it, without curiosity, without foresight, blindly conducted by instinct, and attaining, in a short time, its utmost perfection, beyond which it is never able to advance a single step What a wide difference is there between these creatures! And how exalted a notion must we entertain of the former, in comparison of the latter!

There are two means commonly employed to destroy this conclusion I By making an unfair representation of the case, and insisting only upon the weaknesses of human nature And, II, By forming a new and secret comparison between man and beings of the most perfect wisdom Among the other excellencies of man, this is one, that he can form an idea of perfections much beyond what he has experience of in himself, and is not limited in his conception of wisdom and virtue He can easily exalt his notions, and conceive a degree of knowledge, which, when compared to his own, will make the latter appear very contemptible, and will cause the difference between that and the sagacity of animals, in a manner, to disappear and vanish Now this being a point, in which all the world is agreed, that human understanding falls infinitely short of perfect wisdom, it is proper we should know when this comparison takes place, that we may not dispute where there is no real difference in our sentiments. Man falls much more short of perfect wisdom, and even of his own ideas of perfect wisdom, than animals do of man yet the latter difference is so considerable that nothing but a comparison with the former can make it appear of little moment

It is also usual to *compare* one man with another, and finding very few whom we can call *wise* or *virtuous*, we are apt to entertain a contemptible notion of our species in general That we may be sensible of the fallacy of this way of reasoning, we may observe that the honourable appellations of wise and virtuous, are not annexed to any particular degree of those qualities of *wisdom* and *virtue*, but arise altogether from the comparison we make between one man and another. When we find a man, who arrives at such a pitch of wisdom as is very uncommon, we pronounce him a wise man so that to say, there are few wise men in the world, is really to say nothing, since it is only by their scarcity that they merit that appellation, Were the lowest of our species as wise as Tully, or Lord Bacon, we should still have reason to say that there are few wise men For in that case we should exalt our notions of wisdom, and should not pay a singular honour to any one, who was not singularly distinguished by his talents. In like manner, I have heard it observed by thoughtless people, that there are

few women possessed of beauty, in comparison of those who want it, not considering, that we bestow the epithet of *beautiful* only on such as possess a degree of beauty, that is common to them with a few The same degree of beauty in a woman is called deformity, which is treated as real beauty in one of our sex

As it is usual, in forming a notion of our species, to *compare* it with the other species above or below it, or to compare the individuals of the species among themselves, so we often compare together the different motives or actuating principles of human nature, in order to regulate our judgment concerning it. And, indeed, this is the only kind of comparison which is worth our attention, or decides any thing in the present question Were our selfish and vicious principles so much predominant above our social and virtuous, as is asserted by some philosophers, we ought undoubtedly to entertain a contemptible notion of human nature

There is much of a dispute of words in all this controversy When a man denies the sincerity of all public spirit or affection to a country and community, I am at a loss what to think of him Perhaps he never felt this passion in so clear and distinct a manner as to remove all his doubts concerning its force and reality But when he proceeds afterwards to reject all private friendship, if no interest or self-love intermix itself, I am then confident that he abuses terms, and confounds the ideas of things, since it is impossible for any one to be so selfish, or rather so stupid, as to make no difference between one man and another, and give no preference to qualities, which engage his approbation and esteem Is he also, say I, as insensible to anger as he pretends to be to friendship? And does injury and wrong no more affect him than kindness or benefits? Impossible He does not know himself He has forgotten the movements of his heart, or rather, he makes use of a different language from the rest of his countrymen, and calls not things by their proper names What say you of natural affection? (I subjoin) Is that also a species of self love? Yes All is self-love. *Your* children are loved only because they are yours *Your* friend for a like reason And *your* country engages you only so far as it has a connection with *yourself* Were the idea of self removed, nothing would affect you You would be altogether unactive and insensible Or, if you ever give yourself any movement, it would only be from vanity, and a desire of fame and reputation to this same self I am willing, reply I, to receive your interpretation of human actions, provided you admit the facts That species of self-love, which displays itself in kindness to others, you must allow to have great influence over human actions, and even greater, on many occasions, than that which remains in its original shape and form For how few are there, who, having a family, children, and relations, do not spend more on the maintenance and education of these than on their own pleasures?

This, indeed, you justly observe, may proceed from their self-love, since the prosperity of their family and friends is one, or the chief, of their pleasures, as well as their chief honour Be you also one of these selfish men, and you are sure of every one's good opinion and good will, or, not to shock your ears with these expressions, the self-love of every one, and mine among the rest, will then incline us to serve you, and speak well of you

In my opinion, there are two things which have led astray those philosophers, that have insisted so much on the selfishness of man I They found, that every act of virtue or friendship was attended with a secret pleasure, whence they concluded, that friendship and virtue could not be disinterested But the fallacy of this is obvious The virtuous sentiment or passion produces the pleasure, and does not arise from it I feel a pleasure in doing good to my friend, because I love him, but do not love him for the sake of that pleasure

II It has always been found, that the virtuous are far from being indifferent to praise, and therefore they have been represented as a set of vain-glorious men, who had nothing in view but the applauses of others But this also is a fallacy It is very unjust in the world, when they find any tincture of vanity in a laudable action, to depreciate it upon that account, or ascribe it entirely to that motive. The case is not the same with vanity, as with other passions Where avarice or revenge enters into any seemingly virtuous action, it is difficult for us to determine how far it enters, and it is natural to suppose it the sole actuating principle But vanity is so closely allied to virtue, and to love the fame of laudable actions approaches so near the love of laudable actions for their own sake, that these passions are more capable of mixture, than any other kinds of affection, and it is almost impossible to have the latter without some degree of the former Accordingly, we find, that this passion for glory is always warped and varied according to the particular taste or disposition of the mind on which it falls Nero had the same vanity in driving a chariot, that Trajan had in governing the empire with justice and ability To love the glory of virtuous deeds is a sure proof of the love of virtue

---

XI.—OF CIVIL LIBERTY.

THOSE who employ their pens on political subjects, free from party-rage, and party-prejudices, cultivate a science, which, of all others contributes most to public utility, and even to the private satisfaction of those who addict themselves to the study of it. I am apt, however, to enter-

tain a suspicion, that the world is still too young to fix many general truths in politics which will remain true to the latest posterity. We have not as yet had experience of three thousand years, so that not only the art of reasoning is still imperfect in this science, as in all others, but we even want sufficient materials upon which we can reason. It is not fully known what degree of refinement, either in virtue or vice, human nature is susceptible of, nor what may be expected of mankind from any great revolution in their education, customs, or principles. Michiavel was certainly a great genius; but, having confined his study to the furious and tyrannical governments of ancient times, or to the little disroderly principalities of Italy, his reasonings, especially upon monarchical government, have been found extremely defective; and there scarcely is any maxim in his *Prince* which subsequent experience has not entirely refuted. 'A weak prince,' says he, 'is incapable of receiving good counsel; for, if he consult with several, he will not be able to choose among their different counsels. If he abandon himself to one, that minister may perhaps have capacity, but he will not long be a minister. He will be sure to dispossess his master, and place himself and his family upon the throne.' I mention this, among many instances of the errors of that politician, proceeding, in a great measure, from his having lived in too early an age of the world, to be a good judge of political truth. Almost all the princes of Europe are at present governed by their ministers, and have been so for near two centuries; and yet no such event has ever happened, or can possibly happen. Sejanus might project dethroning the Cæsars; but Fluery though ever so vicious, could not, while in his senses, entertain the least hopes of disposessing the Bourbons.

Trade was never esteemed an affair of state till the last century; and there scarcely is any ancient writer on politics who has made mention of it*. Even the Italians have kept a profound silence with regard to it, though it has now engaged the chief attention, as well of ministers of state as of speculative reasoners. The great opulence, grandeur, and military achievements of the two maritime powers, seem first to have instructed mankind in the vast importance of an extensive commerce.

Having therefore intended, in this essay, to make a full comparison of civil liberty and absolute government, and to show the great advantages of the former above the latter, I began to entertain a suspicion that no man in this age was sufficiently qualified for such an undertaking; and that whatever any one should advance on that head would, in all probability, be refuted by further experience, and be rejected by posterity. Such mighty revolutions have happened in human affairs,

* Xenophon mentions it, but with a doubt if it be of any advantage to a state. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐμπορία ὠφελεῖ τι πόλιν, &c. XEN. HIERO.—Plato totally excludes it from his imaginary republic. De Legibus, lib. iv.

and so many events have arisen contrary to the expectation of the ancients, that they are sufficient to beget the suspicion of still further changes.

It had been observed by the ancients, that all the arts and sciences arose among free nations, and that the Persians and Egyptians, notwithstanding their ease, opulence, and luxury, made but faint efforts towards a relish in those finer pleasures which were carried to such perfection by the Greeks amidst continual wars, attended with poverty, and the greatest simplicity of life and manners It had also been observed that, when the Greeks lost their liberty, though they increased mightily in riches by means of the conquests of Alexander, yet the arts, from that moment, declined among them, and have never since been able to raise their head in that climate. Learning was transplanted to Rome, the only free nation at that time in the universe, and having met with so favourable a soil, it made prodigous shoots for above a century, till the decay of liberty produced also the decay of letters, and spread a total barbarism over the world From these two experiments, of which each was double in its kind, and shewed the fall of learning in absolute governments as well as its rise in popular ones, Longinus thought himself sufficiently justified in asserting, that the arts and sciences could never flourish but in free government and in this opinion he has been followed by several eminent writers Addison and Shaftesbury, in our own country, who either confined their view merely to ancient facts, or entertained too great a partiality in favour of that form of government established among us.

But what would these writers have said to the instances of modern Rome and Florence? Of which the former carried to perfection all the finer arts of sculpture, painting, and music, as well as poetry, though it groaned under tyranny, and under the tyranny of priests while the latter made its chief progress in the arts and sciences, after it began to lose its liberty by the usurpation of the family of Medici Ariosto, Tasso, Galileo, more than Raphael, and Michael Angelo, were not born in republics And though the Lombard school was famous as well as the Roman yet the Venetians have had the smallest share in its honours, and seem rather inferior to the other Italians, in their genius for the arts and sciences. Reubens established his school at Antwerp, not at Amsterdam Dresden, not Hamburgh is the centre of politeness in Germany

But the most eminent instance of the flourishing of learning in absolute governments is that of France, which scarcely ever enjoyed any established liberty, and yet has carried the arts and sciences as near perfection as any other nation. The English are, perhaps, greater philosophers; the Italians better painters and musicians; the Romans were greater orators; But the French are the only people, except the Greeks, who have been at once philosophers, poets, orators

historians, painters, architects, sculptors, and musicians. With regard to the stage, they have excelled even the Greeks, who far excelled the English And, in common life, they have, in great measure, perfected that art, the most useful and agreeable of any *l'Art de Vivre* the art of society and conversation

If we consider the state of the sciences and polite arts in our own country, Horace's observation, with regard to the Romans, may in a great measure be applied to the British

——Sed in longum tamen ævum
Manserunt, hodieque manet vestigia ruris.

The elegance and propriety of style have been very much neglected among us We have no dictionary of our language, and scarcely a tolerable grammar The first polite prose we have was writ by Dr Swift, a man who is still alive As to Sprat, Locke, and even Temple, they knew too little of the rules of art to be esteemed elegant writers The prose of Bacon, Harrington, and Milton, is altogether stiff and pedantic, though their sense be excellent Men, in this country, have been so much occupied in the great disputes of *Religion Politics*, and *Philosophy*, that they had no relish for the seemingly minute observations of grammar and criticism And, though this turn of thinking must have considerably improved our sense and our talent of reasoning, it must be confessed, that, even in those sciences above-mentioned, we have not any standard-book which we can transmit to posterity and the utmost we have to boast of are a few essays towards a more just philosophy , which indeed promise well, but have not as yet reached any degree of perfection

It has become an established opinion, that commerce can never flourish but in a free government and this opinion seems to be founded on a longer and larger experience than the foregoing, with regard to the arts and sciences If we trace commerce in its progress through Tyre, Athens, Syracuse, Carthage, Venice, Florence, Genoa, Antwerp, Holland, England, &c, we shall always find it to have fixed its seat in free governments. The three greatest trading towns now in Europe, are London, Amsterdam, and Hamburgh , all free cities and Protestant cities , that is, enjoying a double liberty It must, however, be observed, that the great jealousy entertained of late, with regard to the commerce of France, seems to prove that this maxim is no more certain and infallible than the foregoing, and that the subjects of an absolute prince may become our rivals in commerce as well as in learning

Durst I deliver my opinion in an affair of so much uncertainty, I would assert, that notwithstanding the efforts of the French, there is something hurtful to commerce inherent in the very nature of absolute government, and inseparable from it though the reason I should as

sign for this opinion is somewhat different from that which is commonly insisted on. Private property seems to me almost as secure in a civilized European monarchy as in a republic; nor is danger much apprehended, in such a government, from the violence of the sovereign, more than we commonly dread harm from thunder, or earthquakes, or any accident the most unusual and extraordinary. Avarice, the spur of industry, is so obstinate a passion, and works its way through so many real dangers and difficulties, that it is not likely to be scared by an imaginary danger, which is so small, that it scarcely admits of calculation. Commerce, therefore, in my opinion, is apt to decay in absolute governments, not because it is there less *secure*, but because it is less *honourable*. A subordination of rank is absolutely necessary to the support of monarchy. Birth, titles, and place, must be honoured above industry and riches. And while these notions prevail, all the considerable traders will be tempted to throw up their commerce, in order to purchase some of those employments, to which privileges and honours are annexed.

Since I am upon this head, of the alterations which time has produced, or may produce in politics, I must observe, that all kinds of government, free and absolute, seem to have undergone, in modern times, a great change for the better, with regard both to foreign and domestic management. The *balance* of power is a secret in politics, fully known only to the present age; and I must add, that the internal Police of states has also received great improvements within the last century. We are informed by Sallust, that Catiline's army was much augmented by the accession of the highwaymen about Rome; though I believe, that all of that profession who are at present dispersed over Europe, would not amount to a regiment. In Cicero's pleadings for Milo, I find this argument, among others, made use of to prove that his client had not assassinated Clodius. Had Milo, said he, intended to have killed Clodius, he had not attacked him in the day-time, and at such a distance from the city. He had way-laid him at night, near the suburbs, where it might have been pretended, that he was killed by robbers; and the frequency of the accident would have favoured the deceit. This is a surprising proof of the loose policy of Rome, and of the number and force of these robbers; since Clodius [Asc. Ped. in Orat. pro Milone] was at that time attended by thirty slaves, who were completely armed, and sufficiently accustomed to blood and danger in the frequent tumults excited by that seditious tribune.

But though all kinds of government be improved in modern times, yet monarchical government seems to have made the greatest advances towards perfection. It may now be affirmed of civilized monarchies, what was formerly said in praise of republics alone, *that they are a government of Laws, not of Men.* They are found susceptible of order, method, and constancy, to a surprising degree. Property is there

secure; industry encouraged, the arts flourish; and the prince lives secure among his subjects, like a father among his children. There are, perhaps, and have been for two centuries, near two hundred absolute princes, great and small, in Europe, and allowing twenty years to each reign, we may suppose, that there have been in the whole two thousand monarchs or tyrants, as the Greeks would have called them yet of these there has not been one, not even Philip II of Spain, so bad as Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, or Domitian, who were four in twelve amongst the Roman emperors It must, however, be confessed, that though monarchical governments have approached nearer to popular ones, in gentleness and stability, they are still inferior Our modern education and customs instill more humanity and moderation than the ancient, but have not as yet been able to overcome entirely the disadvantages of that form of government.

But here I must beg leave to advance a conjecture, which seems probable, but which posterity alone can fully judge of. I am apt to think, that in monarchical governments there is a source of improvement, and in popular governments a source of degeneracy, which in time will bring these species of civil polity still nearer an equality The greatest abuses, which arise in France, the most perfect model of pure monarchy, proceed not from the number or weight of the taxes, beyond what are to be met with in free countries, but from the expensive, unequal, arbitrary, and intricate method of levying them, by which the industry of the poor, especially of the peasants and farmers, is, in a great measure, discouraged, and agriculture rendered a beggarly and slavish employment But to whose advantage do these abuses tend? If to that of the nobility, they might be esteemed inherent in that form of government, since the nobility are the true supports of monarchy, and it is natural their interest should be more consulted, in such a constitution, than that of the people. But the nobility are, in reality, the chief losers by this oppression; since it ruins their estates, and beggars their tenants The only gainers by it are the *Financiers*, a race of men rather odious to the nobility and the whole kingdom. If a prince or minister, therefore, should arise, endowed with sufficent discernment to know his own and the public interest, and with sufficient force of mind to break through ancient customs, we might expect to see these abuses remedied, in which case the difference between that absolute government and our free one, would not appear so considerable as at present

The source of degeneracy, which may be remarked in free governments, *consists in the practice of contracting debt, and mortgaging the public revenues, by which taxes may, in time, become altogether intolerable, and all the property of the state be brought into the hands of the public This practice is of modern date The Athenians though governed by a republic, paid near two hundred *per cent.* for those sums

of money, which any emergence made it necessary for them to borrow, as we learn from Xenophon.* Among the moderns, the Dutch first introduced the practice of borrowing great sums at low interests, and have well nigh ruined themselves by it. Absolute princes have also contracted debt; but as an absolute prince may make a bankruptcy when he pleases, his people can never be oppressed by his debts. In popular governments, the people, and chiefly those who have the highest offices, being commonly the public creditors, it is difficult for the state to make use of this remedy, which, however it may sometimes be necessary, is always cruel and barbarous. This, therefore, seems to be an inconvenience, which nearly threatens all free governments, especially our own, at the present juncture of affairs. And what a strong motive is this, to increase our frugality of public money; lest, for want of it, we be reduced, by the multiplicity of taxes, or what is worse, by our public impotence and inability for defence, to curse our very liberty, and wish ourselves in the same state of servitude with all the nations that surround us?

XII.—OF ELOQUENCE.

THOSE who consider the periods and revolutions of human kind, as represented in history, are entertained with a spectacle full of pleasure and variety, and see with surprise, the manners, customs, and opinions of the same species susceptible of such prodigious changes in different periods of time. It may, however, be observed, that, in *civil* history, there is found a much greater uniformity than in the history of learning and science, and that the wars, negociations, and politics of one age, resemble more those of another than the taste, wit, and speculative principles. Interest and ambition, honour and shame, friendship and enmity, gratitude and revenge, are the prime movers in all public transactions; and these passions are of a very stubborn and untractable nature, in comparison of the sentiments and understanding, which are easily varied by education and example. The Goths were much more inferior to the Romans, in taste and in science, than in courage and in virtue.

But not to compare together nations so widely different; it may be observed, that even this latter period of human learning is, in many

* *Κτησιν δε απ' ουδενος αν ούτω καλην κτησαιντο ὥσπερ αφ' οὗ αν προτελεσωσιν εις την αφορμην—οἱ δε γε πλειστοι Αθηναιων πλειονα ληψονται κατ' ενιαυτον ἠ ὁσα αν εις ενεγκωσιν, οἱ γαρ μναν προτελεσαντες, εγγυς δυοιν μναιν προσοδον εξουσι—ὃ δοκει των ανθρωπινων ασφαλεστατον τε πολυχρονιωτατον ειναι.* ΞΕΝ. ΠΟΡΟΙ.

respects, of an opposite character to the ancient; and that, if we be superior in philosophy, we are still, notwithstanding all our refinements, much inferior in eloquence.

In ancient times, no work of genius was thought to require so great parts and capacity, as the speaking in public; and some eminent writers have pronounced the talents, even of a great poet or philosopher, to be of an inferior nature to those which are requisite for such an undertaking. Greece and Rome produced, each of them, but one accomplished orator; and whatever praises the other celebrated speakers might merit, they were still esteemed much inferior to these great models of eloquence. It is observable, that the ancient critics could scarcely find two orators in any age, who deserved to be placed precisely in the same rank, and possessed the same degree of merit. Calvus, Cælius, Curio, Hortensius, Cæsar, rose one above another: but the greatest of that age was inferior to Cicero, the most eloquent speaker that had ever appeared in Rome. Those of fine taste, however, pronounced this judgment of the Roman orator, as well as of the Grecian, that both of them surpassed in eloquence all that ever appeared, but that they were far from reaching the perfection of their art, which was infinite, and not only exceeded human force to attain, but human imagination to conceive. Cicero declares himself satisfied with his own performances; nay, even with those of Demosthenes. *Ita sunt avidæ et capaces meæ aures*, says he, *et semper aliquid immensum, infinitumque desiderant*.

Of all the polite and learned nations, England alone possesses a popular government, or admits into the legislature such numerous assemblies as can be supposed to lie under the dominion of eloquence. But what has England to boast of in this particular? In enumerating the great men, who have done honour to our country, we exult in our poets and philosophers; but what orators are ever mentioned? Or where are the monuments of their genius to be met with? There are found, indeed, in our histories, the names of several, who directed the resolutions of our parliament: but neither themselves nor others have taken the pains to preserve their speeches: and the authority, which they possessed, seems to have been owing to their experience, wisdom, or power, more than to their talents for oratory. At present, there are above half dozen speakers in the two houses, who, in the judgment of the public, have reached very near the same pitch of eloquence; and no man pretends to give any one the preference above the rest. This seems to me a certain proof, that none of them have attained much beyond a mediocrity in their art, and that the species of eloquence, which they aspire to, gives no exercise to the sublimer faculties of the mind, but may be reached by ordinary talents and a slight application. A hundred cabinet-makers in London can work a table or a chair

equally well, but no one can write verses with such spirit and elegance as Mr Pope

We are told, that when Demosthenes was to plead, all ingenious men flocked to Athens from the most remote parts of Greece, as to the most celebrated spectacle of the world * At London you may see men sauntering in the court of requests, while the most important debate is carrying on in the two houses, and many do not think themselves sufficiently compensated for the losing of their dinners, by all the eloquence of our most celebrated speakers When old Cibber is to act, the curiosity of several is more excited, than when our prime minister is to defend himself from a motion for his removal or impeachment

Even a person, unacquainted with the noble remains of ancient orators may judge, from a few strokes, that the style or species of their eloquence was infinitely more sublime than that which modern orators aspire to How absurd would it appear, in our temperate and calm speakers, to make use of an *Apostrophe*, like that noble one of Demosthenes, so much celebrated by Quintilian and Longinus, when, justifying the unsuccessful battle of Chæronea, he breaks out, ' No, my ' Fellow-Citizens, No You have not erred I swear by the *manes* of ' those heroes who fought for the same cause in the plains of Mara- ' thon and Platæa ' Who could now endure such a bold and poetical figure as that which Cicero employs, after describing, in the most tragical terms, the crucifixion of a Roman citizen ? ' Should I paint ' the horrors of this scene, not to Roman citizens, not to the allies of ' our state, not to those who have ever heard of the Roman Name, ' not even to men, but to brute creatures or, to go farther, should I ' lift up my voice, in the most desolate solitude, to the rocks and ' mountains, yet should I surely see those rude and inanimate parts of ' nature moved with horror and indignation at the recital of so enor- ' mous an action '† With what a blaze of eloquence must such a sentence be surrounded to give it grace, or cause it to make any impression on the hearers? And what noble art and sublime talents are requisite to arrive, by just degrees, at a sentiment so bold and excessive to inflame the audience, so as to make them accompany the speaker in such violent passions, and such elevated conceptions, and to conceal, under a torrent of eloquence, the artifice, by which all this is effectuated! Should this sentiment even appear to us excessive, as

* Ne illud quidem intelligunt, non modo ita memoriae proditum esse sed ita necesse fuisse, cum Demosthenes dicturus esset, ut concursus audiendi causa, ex tota Græcia fierent. At cum isti Attici dicunt, non modo a corona (quod est ipsum miserabile) sed etiam ab advocatis relinquuntur —*Cicero de Claris Oratoribus*

† The original is: ' Quod si hæc non ad cives Romanos, non ad aliquos amicos nostrae civitatis, non ad eos qui populi Romani nomen audissent denique, si non ad homines, verum ad bestias aut etiam, ut longius progrediar, si in aliqua desertissima solitudine ad saxa and ad scopulos hæc conqueri et deplorare vellem, tamen omnia muta atque inanima, tanta et tam indigna rerum atrocitate commoverentur —*Cic in Ver*

perhaps it justly may, it will at least serve to give an idea of the style of ancient eloquence, where such swelling expressions were not rejected as wholly monstrous and gigantic.

Suitable to this vehemence of thought and expression was the vehemence of action, observed in the ancient orators. The *supplosio pedis*, or stamping with the foot, was one of the most usual and moderate gestures which they made use of,* though that is now esteemed too violent, either for the senate, bar, or pulpit, and is only admitted into the theatre, to accompany the most violent passions, which are there represented.

One is somewhat at a loss to what cause we may ascribe so sensible a decline of eloquence in latter ages. The genius of mankind, at all times, is, perhaps equal: the moderns have applied themselves, with great industry and success, to all the other arts and sciences: and a learned nation possesses a popular government, a circumstance which seems requisite for the full display of these noble talents: but notwithstanding all these advantages, our progress in eloquence is very inconsiderable, in comparison of the advances which we have made in all other parts of learning.

Shall we assert, that the strains of ancient eloquence are unsuitable to our age, and ought not to be imitated by modern orators? Whatever reasons may be made use of to prove this, I am persuaded they will be found, upon examination, to be unsound and unsatisfactory.

I. It may be said that, in ancient times, during the flourishing period of Greek and Roman learning, the municipal laws, in every state, were but few and simple, and the decision of causes was, in a great measure, left to the equity and common sense of the judges. The study of the laws was not then a laborious occupation, requiring the drudgery of a whole life to finish it, and incompatible with every other study or profession. The great statesmen and generals among the Romans were all lawyers, and Cicero, to shew the facility of acquiring this science, declares, that in the midst of all his occupations, he would undertake, in a few days, to make himself a complete civilian. Now, where a pleader addresses himself to the equity of his judges, he has much more room to display his eloquence, than where he must draw his arguments from strict laws, statutes, and precedents. In the former case, many circumstances must be taken in, many personal considerations regarded, and even favour and inclination, which it belongs to the orator, by his art and eloquence, to conciliate, may be disguised under the appearance of equity. But how shall a modern lawyer have leisure to quit his toilsome occupations, in order to gather

* *Ubi dolor? Ubi* ardor animi, qui etiam ex infantium ingeniis elicere voces et querelas solet? nulla perturbatio animi, nulla corporis: frons non percussa, non femur; pedis (*quod minimum est*) nulla supplosio. Itaque tantum abfuit ut inflammares nostros animos, somnum isto loco vix tenebamus.—*Cicero de Claris Oratoribus.*

the flowers of Parnassus? Or what opportunity shall he have of displaying them, amidst the rigid and subtle arguments, objections, and replies, which he is obliged to make use of? The greatest genius, and greatest orator, who should pretend to plead before the *Chancellor*, after a month's study of the laws, would only labour to make himself ridiculous.

I am ready to own, that this circumstance, of the multiplicity and intricacy of laws, is a discouragement to eloquence in modern times: but I assert, that it will not entirely account for the decline of that noble art. It may banish oratory from Westminster-Hall, but not from either house of parliament. Among the Athenians, the Areopagites expressly forbade all allurements of eloquence; and some have pretended that in the Greek orations, written in the *judiciary* form, there is not so bold and rhetorical a style as appears in the Roman. But to what a pitch did the Athenians carry their eloquence in the *deliberative* kind, when affairs of state were canvassed, and the liberty, happiness, and honour of the republic were the subject of debate? Disputes of this nature elevate the genius above all others, and give the fullest scope to eloquence; and such disputes are very frequent in this nation.

II. It may be pretended that the decline of eloquence is owing to the superior good sense of the moderns, who reject with disdain all those rhetorical tricks employed to seduce the judges, and will admit of nothing but solid argument in any debate of deliberation. If a man be accused of murder, the fact must be proved by witnesses and evidence, and the laws will afterwards determine the punishment of the criminal. It would be ridiculous to describe, in strong colours, the horror and cruelty of the action: to introduce the relations of the dead, and, at a signal, make them throw themselves at the feet of the judges, imploring justice, with tears and lamentations: and still more ridiculous would it be, to employ a picture representing the bloody deed, in order to move the judges by the display of so tragical a spectacle: though we know that this artifice was sometimes practised by the pleaders of old. [QUINTIL. lib. vi. cap. 1.] Now, banish the pathetic from our public discourses, and you reduce the speakers merely to modern eloquence; that is, to good sense delivered in proper expressions.

Perhaps it may be acknowledged that our modern customs, or our superior good sense, if you will, should make our orators more cautious and reserved than the ancient, in attempting to inflame the passions, or elevate the imagination of their audience: but I see no reason why it should make them despair absolutely of succeeding in that attempt. It should make them redouble their art, not abandon it entirely. The ancient orators seem also to have been on their guard against this jealousy of their audience; but they took a different way of eluding it.

[LONGINUS, cap. 15.] They hurried away with such a torrent of sublime and pathetic, that they left their hearers no leisure to perceive the artifice by which they were deceived. Nay, to consider the matter aright, they were not deceived by any artifice. The orator, by the force of his own genius and eloquence, first inflamed himself with anger, indignation, pity, sorrow; and then communicated those impetuous movements to his audience.

Does any man pretend to have more good sense than Julius Cæsar? yet that haughty conqueror, we know, was so subdued by the charms of Cicero's eloquence, that he was, in a manner, constrained to change his settled purpose and resolution, and to absolve a criminal, whom, before that orator pleaded, he was determined to condemn.

Some objections, I own, notwithstanding his vast success, may lie against some passages of the Roman orator. He is too florid and rhetorical: his figures are too striking and palpable: the divisions of his discourse are drawn chiefly from the rules of the schools: and his wit disdains not always the artifice even of a pun, rhyme, or jingle of words. The Grecian addressed himself to an audience much less refined than the Roman senate or judges. The lowest vulgar of Athens were his sovereigns, and the arbiters of his eloquence.* Yet is his manner more chaste and austere than that of the other. Could it be copied, its success would be infallible over a modern assembly. It is rapid harmony, exactly adjusted to the sense: It is vehement reasoning, without any appearance of art: it is disdain, anger, boldness, freedom, involved in a continued stream of argument: and, of all human productions, the orations of Demosthenes present to us the models which approach the nearest to perfection.

III. It may be pretended, that the disorders of the ancient governments, and the enormous crimes of which the citizens were often guilty, afforded much ampler matter for eloquence than can be met with among the moderns. Were there no Verres or Catiline, there would be no Cicero. But that this reason can have no great influence is evident. It would be easy to find a Philip in modern times; but where shall we find a Demosthenes?

What remains, then, but that we lay the blame on the want of genius, or of judgment, in our speakers, who either found themselves incapable of reaching the heights of ancient eloquence, or rejected all such endeavours, as unsuitable to the spirit of modern assemblies? A few successful attempts of this nature might rouse the genius of the

* The orators formed the taste of the Athenian people, not the people of the orators. Gorgias Leontinus was very taking with them, till they became acquainted with a better manner. His figures of speech, says Diodorus Siculus, his antithesis, his ισοκωλον, his ομοιοτελευτον, which are now despised, had a great effect upon the audience. Lib. xii. p. 106. *ex editione* Rhod. It is in vain therefore for modern orators to plead the taste of their hearers as an apology for their lame performances. It would be strange prejudice in favour of antiquity, not to allow a British parliament to be naturally superior in judgment and delicacy to an Athenian mob.

nation, excite the emulation of the youth, and accustom our ears to a more sublime and more pathetic elocution, than what we have been hitherto entertained with There is certainly something accidental in the first rise and the progress of the arts in any nation I doubt whether a very satisfactory reason can be given, why ancient Rome, though it received all its refinements from Greece, could attain only to a relish for statuary, painting, and architecture, without reaching the practice of these arts while modern Rome has been excited by a few remains found among the ruins of antiquity, and has produced artists of the greatest eminence and distinction Had such a cultivated genius for oratory, as Waller's for poetry, arisen during the civil wars, when liberty began to be fully established, and popular assemblies to enter into all the most material points of government, I am persuaded so illustrious an example would have given a quite different turn to British eloquence, and made us reach the perfection of the ancient model Our orators would then have done honour to their country, as well as our poets, geometers, and philosophers, and British Ciceros have appeared, as well as British Archimedeses and Virgils

It is seldom or never found, when a false taste in poetry or eloquence prevails among any people, that it has been preferred to a true, upon comparison and reflection it commonly prevails merely from ignorance of the true, and from the want of perfect models to lead men into a juster apprehension, and more refined relish of those productions of genius When *these* appear, they soon unite all suffrages in their favour, and by their natural and powerful charms, gain over, even the most prejudiced, to the love and admiration of them The principles of every passion, and of every sentiment, is in every man, and, when touched properly, they rise to life, and warm the heart, and convey that satisfaction, by which a work of genius is distinguished from the adulterate beauties of a capricious wit and fancy And, if this observation be true, with regard to all the liberal arts it must be peculiarly so with regard to eloquence, which, being merely calculated for the public, and for men of the world, cannot, with any pretence of reason, appeal from the people to more refined judges, but must submit to the public verdict without reserve or limitation Whoever, upon comparison, is deemed by a common audience the greatest orator, ought most certainly to be pronounced such by men of science and erudition And though an indifferent speaker may triumph for a long time, and be esteemed altogether perfect by the vulgar, who are satisfied with his accomplishments, and know not in what he is defective, yet, whenever the true genius arises, *he* draws to him the attention of every one, and immediately appears superior to his rival

Now, to judge by this rule, ancient eloquence, that is, the sublime and passionate, is of a much juster taste than the modern, or the argumentative and rational, and, if properly executed, will always

have more command and authority over mankind. We are satisfied with our mediocrity, because we have had no experience of anything better: but the ancients had experience of both; and upon comparison, gave the preference to that kind of which they have left us such applauded models. For, if I mistake not, our modern eloquence is of the same style or species with that which ancient critics denominated Attic eloquence, that is, calm, elegant, and subtile, which instructed the reason more than affected the passions, and never raised its tone above argument or common discourse. Such was the eloquence of Lysias among the Athenians, and of Calvus among the Romans. These were esteemed in their time; but, when compared with Demosthenes and Cicero, were eclipsed like a taper when set in the rays of a meridian sun. Those latter orators possessed the same elegance, and subtilty, and force of argument with the former; but, what rendered them chiefly admirable, was that pathetic and sublime, which, on proper occasions, they threw into their discourse, and by which they commanded the resolution of their audience.

Of this species of eloquence we have scarcely had any instance in England, at least in our public speakers. In our writers, we have had some instances which have met with great applause, and might assure our ambitious youth of equal or superior glory in attempts for the revival of ancient eloquence. Lord Bolingbroke's productions, with all their defects in argument, method, and precision, contain a force and energy which our orators scarcely ever aim at; though it is evident that such an elevated style has much better grace in a speaker than in a writer, and is assured of more prompt and more astonishing success. It is there seconded by the graces of voice and action: the movements are mutually communicated between the orator and the audience: and the very aspect of a large assembly, attentive to the discourse of one man, must inspire him with a peculiar elevation, sufficient to give a propriety to the strongest figures and expressions. It is true, there is a great prejudice against *set speeches*; and a man cannot escape ridicule, who repeats a discourse as a school-boy does his lesson, and takes no notice of anything that has been advanced in the course of the debate. But where is the necessity of falling into this absurdity? A public speaker must know beforehand the question under debate. He may compose all the arguments, objections, and answers, such as he thinks will be most proper for his discourse*. If anything new occur, he may supply it from his invention; nor will the difference be very apparent between his elaborate and his extemporary compositions. The mind naturally continues with the same *impetus* or *force*, which it has acquired by its motion; as a vessel, once im-

* The first of the Athenians, who composed and wrote his speeches was Pericles, a man of business and a man of sense, if ever there was one, *Πρωτος γραπτον λογον εν δικαστηριω ειπε, των προ αυτου σχεδιαζοντων*. Suidas in Περικλης.

pelled by the oars, carries on its course for some time, when the original impulse is suspended

I shall conclude this subject with observing, that, even though our modern orators should not elevate their style, or aspire to a rivalship with the ancient, yet is there, in most of their speeches, a material defect, which they might correct, without departing from that composed air of argument and reasoning, to which they limit their ambition. Their great affectation of extemporary discourses has made them reject all order and method, which seems so requisite to argument, and without which it is scarcely possible to produce an entire conviction on the mind It is not, that one would recommend many divisions in a public discourse, unless the subject very evidently offer them but it is easy, without this formality, to observe a method, and make that method conspicuous to the hearers who will be infinitely pleased to see the arguments rise naturally from one another, and will retain a more thorough persuasion, than can arise from the strongest reasons which are thrown together in confusion

---

XIII.—OF THE RISE AND THE PROGRESS OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES

NOTHING requires greater nicety, in our inquiries concerning human affairs, than to distinguish exactly what is owing to *chance*, and what proceeds from *causes*, nor is there any subject, in which an author is more liable to deceive himself by false subtleties and refinements. To say, that any event is derived from chance, cuts short all farther inquiry concerning it, and leaves the writer in the same state of ignorance with the rest of mankind But when the event is supposed to proceed from certain and stable causes, he may then display his ingenuity, in assigning these causes, and as a man of any subtlety can never be at a loss in this particular, he has thereby an opportunity of swelling his volumes, and discovering his profound knowledge, in observing what escapes the vulgar and ignorant.

The distinguishing between chance and causes must depend upon every particular man's sagacity, in considering every particular incident. But, if I were to assign any general rule to help us in applying this distinction, it would be the following, *What depends upon a few persons is, in a great measure, to be ascribed to chance, or secret and unknown causes what arises from a great number, may often be accounted for by determinate and known causes.*

Two natural reasons may be assigned for this rule. I. If you sup

pose a die to have any bias, however small, to a particular side, this bias, though, perhaps, it may not appear in a few throws, will certainly prevail in a great number, and will cast the balance entirely to that side In like manner, when any *causes* beget a particular inclination or passion, at a certain time, and among a certain people, though many individuals may escape the contagion, and be ruled by passions peculiar to themselves, yet the multitude will certainly be seized by the common affection, and be governed by it in all their actions

II Those principles or causes which are fitted to operate on a multitude, are always of a grosser and more stubborn nature, less subject to accidents, and less influenced by whim and private fancy, than those which operate on a few only The latter are commonly so delicate and refined, that the smallest incident in the health, education, or fortune of a particular person, is sufficient to divert their course and retard their operation nor is it possible to reduce them to any general maxims or observations Their influence at one time will never assure us concerning their influence at another, even though all the general circumstances should be the same in both cases

To judge by this rule, the domestic and the gradual revolutions of a state must be a more proper subject of reasoning and observation, than the foreign and the violent which are commonly produced by single persons, and are more influenced by whim, folly, or caprice, than by general passions and interests The depression of the lords, and rise of the commons in England, after the statutes of alienation and the increase of trade and industry, are more easily accounted for by general principles, than the depression of the Spanish, and rise of the French monarchy, after the death of Charles Quint Had Harry IV Cardinal Richelieu and Louis XIV been Spaniards, and Philip II III and IV and Charles II been Frenchmen, the history of these two nations had been entirely reversed

For the same reason, it is more easy to account for the rise and progress of commerce in any kingdom, than for that of learning, and a state, which should apply itself to the encouragement of the one, would be more assured of success, than one which should cultivate the other Avarice, or the desire of gain, is an universal passion, which operates at all times, in all places, and upon all persons but curiosity, or the love of knowledge, has a very limited influence, and requires youth, leisure, education, genius, and example, to make it govern any person You will never want booksellers, while there are buyers of books but there may frequently be readers where there are no authors Multitudes of people, necessity, and liberty, have begotten commerce in Holland but study and application have scarcely produced any eminent writers

We may, therefore, conclude, that there is no subject, in which we must proceed with more caution, than in tracing the history of the arts

and sciences, lest we assign causes which never existed, and reduce what is merely contingent to stable and universal principles. Those who cultivate the sciences in any state, are always few in number: the passion, which governs them, limited: their taste and judgment delicate and easily perverted: and their application disturbed with the smallest accident. Chance, therefore, or secret and unknown causes must have a great influence on the rise and progress of all the refined arts.

But there is a reason, which induces me not to ascribe the matter altogether to chance. Though the persons, who cultivate the sciences with such astonishing success as to attract the admiration of posterity, be always few, in all nations and all ages; it is impossible but a share of the same spirit and genius must be antecedently diffused through the people among whom they arise, in order to produce, form, and cultivate, from their earliest infancy, the taste and judgment of those eminent writers. The mass cannot be altogether insipid, from which such refined spirits are extracted. *There is a God within us*, says Ovid, *who breathes that divine fire, by which we are animated.** Poets in all ages have advanced this claim to inspiration. There is not, however, anything supernatural in the case. Their fire is not kindled from heaven. It only runs along the earth; is caught from one breast to another; and burns brightest where the materials are best prepared, and most happily disposed. The question, therefore, concerning the rise and progress of the arts and sciences is not altogether a question concerning the taste, genius, and spirit of a few, but concerning those of a whole people; and may, therefore be accounted for, in some measure, by general causes and principles. I grant that a man, who should inquire, why such a particular poet, as Homer, for instance, existed, at such a place, in such a time, would throw himself headlong into chimæra, and could never treat of such a subject, without a multitude of false subtleties and refinements. He might as well pretend to give a reason, why such particular generals as Fabius and Scipio, lived in Rome at such a time, and why Fabius came into the world before Scipio. For such incidents as these, no other reason can be given than that of Horace:

Scit genius, natale comes, qui temperat astrum,
Naturæ Deus humanæ, mortalis in unum—
—Quodque caput, vultu mutabilis, albus et ater.

But I am persuaded, that in many cases good reasons might be given, why such a nation is more polite and learned, at a particular time, than any of its neighbours. At least, this is so curious a subject, that it were a pity to abandon it entirely, before we have found whether

* Est Deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo:
Impetus hic, sacræ semina mentis habet.—*Ovid, Fast. lib. 1.*

it be susceptible of reasoning, and can be reduced to any general principles

My first observation on this head is, *That it is impossible for the arts and sciences to arise, at first, among any people unless that people enjoy the blessing of a free government*

In the first ages of the world, when men are as yet barbarous and ignorant, they seek no farther security against mutual violence and injustice, than the choice of some rulers, few or many, in whom they place an implicit confidence, without providing any security, by laws or political institutions, against the violence and injustice of these rulers If the authority be centered in a single person, and if the people, either by conquest, or by the ordinary course of propagation increase to a great multitude, the monarch finding it impossible, in his own person, to execute every office of sovereignty, in every place, must delegate his authority to inferior magistrates, who preserve peace and order in their respective districts As experience and education have not yet refined the judgments of men to any considerable degree, the prince, who is himself unrestrained, never dreams of restraining his ministers, but delegates his full authority to every one, whom he sets over any portion of the people All general laws are attended with inconveniences, when applied to particular cases, and it requires great penetration and experience, both to perceive that these inconveniences are fewer than what result from full discretionary powers, in every magistrate and also to discern what general laws are, upon the whole, attended with fewest inconveniences This is a matter of so great difficulty, that men may have made some advances, even in the sublime arts of poetry and eloquence, where a rapidity of genius and imagination assists their progress, before they have arrived at any great refinement in their municipal laws, where frequent trials and diligent observation can alone direct their improvements It is not, therefore, to be supposed, that a barbarous monarch, unrestrained and uninstructed, will ever become a legislator or think of restraining his *Bashaws*, in every province or even his *Cadis*, in every village We are told, that the late *Czar*, though actuated with a noble genius, and smit with the love and admiration of European arts, yet professed an esteem for the Turkish policy in this particular, and approved of such summary decisions of causes, as are practised in that barbarous monarchy, where the judges are not restrained by any methods, forms, or laws He did not perceive, how contrary such a practice would have been to all his other endeavours for refining his people Arbitrary power, in all cases, is somewhat oppressive and debasing; but it is altogether ruinous and intolerable, when contracted into a small compass, and becomes still worse, when the person, who possesses it, knows that the time of his authority is limited and uncertain. *Habet subjectos tanquam suos, viles, ut alienos* [TACIT. HIST lib. I.] He

governs the subjects with full authority as if they were his own; and with negligence or tyranny, as belonging to another A people, governed after such a manner are slaves in the full and proper sense of the word, and it is impossible they can ever aspire to any refinements of taste or reason They dare not so much as pretend to enjoy the necessaries of life in plenty or security

To expect, therefore, that the arts and sciences should take their first rise in a monarchy, is to expect a contradiction Before these refinements have taken place, the monarch is ignorant and uninstructed, and not having knowledge sufficient to make him sensible of the necessity of balancing his government upon general laws, he delegates his full power to all inferior magistrates This barbarous policy debases the people, and for ever prevents all improvements Were it possible, that, before science were known in the world, a monarch could possess so much wisdom as to become a legislator, and govern his people by law not by the arbitrary will of their fellow-subjects, it might be possible for that species of government to be the first nursery of arts and sciences But that supposition seems scarcely to be consistent or rational

It may happen, that a republic, in its infant state, may be supported by as few laws as a barbarous monarchy, and may entrust as unlimited an authority to its magistrates or judges But, besides that the frequent elections by the people are a considerable check upon authority, it is impossible, but, in time, the necessity of restraining the magistrates, in order to preserve liberty, must at last appear, and give rise to general laws and statutes The Roman Consuls, for some time, decided all causes, without being confined by any positive statutes, till the people, bearing this yoke with impatience, created the *decemvirs*, who promulgated the *twelve tables*, a body of laws, which, though, perhaps, they were not equal in bulk to one English act of parliament, were almost the only written rules, which regulated property and punishment, for some ages, in that famous republic They were, however, sufficient, together with the forms of a free government, to secure the lives and properties of the citizens, to exempt one man from the dominion of another and to protect every one against the violence or tyranny of his fellow-citizens In such a situation the sciences may raise their heads and flourish, but never can have being amidst such a scene of oppression and slavery, as always results from barbarous monarchies, where the people alone are restrained by the authority of the magistrates, and the magistrates are not restrained by any law or statute An unlimited despotism of this nature, while it exists, effectually puts a stop to all improvements, and keeps men from attaining that knowledge, which is requisite to instruct them in the advantages arising from a better policy, and more moderate authority.

Here then are the advantages of free states. Though a republic

should be barbarous, it necessarily, by an infallible operation, gives rise to Law, even before mankind have made any considerable advances in the other sciences. From law arises security: from security curiosity: and from curiosity knowledge. The latter steps of this progress may be more accidental; but the former are altogether necessary. A republic without laws can never have any duration. On the contrary, in a monarchical government, law arises not necessarily from the forms of government. Monarchy, when absolute, contains even something repugnant to law. Great wisdom and reflection can alone reconcile them. But such a degree of wisdom can never be expected, before the greater refinements and improvements of human reason. These refinements require curiosity, security, and law. The *first* growth, therefore, of the arts and sciences, can never be expected in despotic governments.

There are other causes, which discourage the rise of the refined arts in despotic governments; though I take the want of laws, and the delegation of full powers to every petty magistrate, to be the principal. Eloquence certainly springs up more naturally in popular governments. Emulation, too, in every accomplishment, must there be more animated and enlivened; and genius and capacity have a fuller scope and career. All these causes render free governments the only proper *nursery* for the arts and sciences.

The next observation which I shall make on this head is, *That nothing is more favourable to the rise of politeness and learning, than a number of neighbouring and independent states, connected together by commerce and policy.* The emulation, which naturally arises among those neighbouring states, is an obvious source of improvement: but what I would chiefly insist on is the stop, which such limited territories give both to *power* and to *authority*.

Extended governments, where a single person has great influence, soon become absolute; but small ones change naturally into commonwealths. A large government is accustomed by degrees to tyranny; because each act of violence is at first performed upon a part, which, being distant from the majority, is not taken notice of, nor excites any violent ferment. Besides, a large government, though the whole be discontented, may, by a little art, be kept in obedience; while each part, ignorant of the resolutions of the rest, is afraid to begin any commotion or insurrection. Not to mention, that there is a superstitious reverence for princes, which mankind naturally contract when they do not often see the sovereign, and when many of them become not acquainted with him so as to perceive his weaknesses. And as large states can afford a great expence, in order to support the pomp of majesty; this is a kind of fascination on men, and naturally contributes to the enslaving of them.

In a small government, any act of oppression is immediately known throughout the whole: the murmurs and discontents proceed-

ing from it, are easily communicated; and the indignation arises the higher, because the subjects are not apt to apprehend, in such states, that the distance is very wide between themselves and their sovereign. 'No man,' said the prince of Conde, 'is a hero to his *Valet de Chambre*.' It is certain that admiration and acquaintance are altogether incompatible towards any mortal creature. Sleep and love convinced even Alexander himself that he was not a God; but I suppose that such as daily attended him could easily, from the numberless weaknesses to which he was subject, have given him many still more convincing proofs of his humanity.

But the divisions into small states, are favourable to learning, by stopping the progress to *authority* as well as that of *power*. Reputation is often as great a fascination upon men as sovereignty, and is equally destructive to the freedom of thought and examination. But were a number of neighbouring states have a great intercourse of arts and commerce, their mutual jealousy keeps them from receiving too lightly the law from each other, in matters of taste and of reasoning, and makes them examine every work of art with the greatest care and accuracy. The contagion of popular opinion spreads not so easily from one place to another. It readily receives a check in some state or other, where it concurs not with the prevailing prejudices. And nothing but nature and reason, or at least what bears them a strong resemblance, can force its way through all obstacles, and unite the most rival nations into an esteem and admiration of it.

Greece was a cluster of little principalities, which soon became republics; and being united both by their near neighbourhood and by the ties of the same language and interest, they entered into the closest intercourse of commerce and learning. There concurred a happy climate, a soil not unfertile, and a most harmonious and comprehensive language; so that every circumstance among that people seemed to favour the rise of the arts and sciences. Each city produced its several artists and philosophers, who refused to yield the preference to the neighbouring republics: their contention and debates sharpened the wits of men: a variety of objects was presented to the judgment, while each challenged the preference to the rest: and the sciences, not being dwarfed by the restraint of authority, were enabled to make such considerable shoots, as are even at this time, the objects of our admiration. After the Roman *Christian*, or *Catholic* church, had spread itself over the civilized world, and had engrossed all the learning of the times; being really one large state within itself, and united under one head; this variety of sects immediately disappeared, and the Peripatetic philosophy was alone admitted into all the schools, to the utter depravation of every kind of learning. But mankind, having at length thrown off this yoke, affairs are now returned nearly to the same situation as before, and Europe is at present a copy, at

large, of what Greece was formerly a pattern in miniature. We have seen the advantage of this situation in several instances. What checked the progress of the Cartesian philosophy, to which the French nation shewed such a strong propensity towards the end of the last century, but the opposition made to it by the other nations of Europe, who soon discovered the weak sides of that philosophy? The severest scrutiny, which Newton's theory has undergone, proceeded not from his own countrymen, but from foreigners; and if it can overcome the obstacles, which it meets with at present in all parts of Europe, it will probably go down triumphant to the latest posterity. The English are become sensible of the scandalous licentiousness of their stage, from the example of the French decency and morals. The French are convinced, that their theatre has become somewhat effeminate, by too much love and gallantry; and begin to approve of the more masculine taste of some neighbouring nations.

In China there seems to be a pretty considerable stock of politeness and science, which, in the course of so many centuries, might naturally be expected to ripen into something more perfect and finished, than what has yet arisen from them. But China is one vast empire, speaking one language, governed by one law, and sympathising in the same manners. The authority of any teacher, such as Confucius, was propagated easily from one corner of the empire to the other. None had courage to resist the torrent of popular opinion. And posterity was not bold enough to dispute what had been universally received by their ancestors. This seems to be one natural reason, why the sciences have made so slow a progress in that mighty empire.*

If we consider the face of the globe, Europe, of all the four parts of the world, is the most broken by seas, rivers, and mountains; and Greece of all countries of Europe. Hence these regions were naturally divided into several distinct governments. And hence the sciences arose in Greece; and Europe has been hitherto the most constant habitation of them.

I have sometimes been inclined to think, that interruptions in the

* If it be asked how we can reconcile to the foregoing principles the happiness, riches, and good policy of the Chinese, who have always been governed by a monarch, and can scarcely form an idea of a free government; I would answer, that though the Chinese government be a pure monarchy, it is not, properly speaking, absolute. This proceeds from a peculiarity in the situation of that country: They have no neighbours, except the Tartars, from whom they were, in some measure, secured, at least seemed to be secured, by their famous wall, and by the great superiority of their numbers. By this means, military discipline has always been much neglected amongst them; and their standing forces are mere militia, of the worst kind, and unfit to suppress any general insurrection in countries so extremely populous. The sword, therefore, may properly be said to be always in the hands of the people, which is a sufficient restraint upon the monarch, and obliges him to lay his *mandarins*, or governors of provinces, under the restraint of general laws, in order to prevent those rebellions, which we learn from history to have been so frequent and dangerous in that government. Perhaps a pure monarchy of this kind, were it fitted for defence against foreign enemies, would be the best of all governments, as having both the tranquility attending kingly power, and the moderation and liberty of popular assemblies.

periods of learning, where they not attended with such a destruction of ancient books, and the records of history, would be rather favourable to the arts and sciences, by breaking the progress of authority, and dethroning the tyrannical usurpers over human reason In this particular, they have the same influence, as interruptions in political governments and societies Consider the blind submission of the ancient philosophers to the several masters in each school, and you will be convinced, that little good could be expected from a hundred centuries of such a servile philosophy Even the Eclectics, who arose about the age of Augustus, notwithstanding their professing to chuse freely what pleased them from every different sect, were yet, in the main, as slavish and dependent as any of their brethren, since they sought for truth, not in Nature, but in the several schools, where they supposed she must necessarily be found, though not united in a body, yet dispersed in parts Upon the revival of learning, those sects of Stoics and Epicureans, Platonists and Pythagoricians, could never regain any credit or authority, and, at the same time, by the example of their fall, kept men from submitting, with such blind deference, to those new sects, which have attempted to gain an ascendant over them

The *third* observation, which I shall form on this head, of the rise and progress of the arts and sciences, is, *That though the only proper* Nursery *of these noble plants be a free state, yet may they be transplanted into any government, and that a republic is most favourable to the growth of the sciences and a civilized monarchy to that of the polite arts*

To balance a large state of society whether monarchical or republican, on general laws, is a work of so great difficulty, that no human genius, however comprehensive, is able, by the mere dint of reason and reflection, to effect it The judgments of many must unite in this work experience must guide their labour time must bring it to perfection and the feeling of inconveniencies must correct the mistakes, which they inevitably fall into, in their first trials and experiments Hence appears the impossibility, that this undertaking should be begun and carried on in any monarchy, since such a form of government, ere civilized knows no other secret or policy, than that of entrusting unlimited powers to every governor or magistrate, and subdividing the people into so many classes and orders of slavery From such a situation, no improvement can ever be expected in the sciences, in the liberal arts, in laws, and scarcely in the manual arts and manufactures. The same barbarism and ignorance, with which the government commences, is propagated to all posterity, and can never come to a period by the efforts or ingenuity of such unhappy slaves

But though law, the source of all security and happiness, arises late in any government, and is the slow product of order and liberty, it is

not preserved with the same difficulty with which it is produced; but when it has once taken root, is a hardy plant, which will scarcely ever perish through the ill culture of men, or the rigeur of the seasons. The arts of luxury, and much more the liberal arts, which depend on a refined taste or sentiment, are easily lost, because they are always relished by a few only, whose leisure, fortune, and genius, fit them for such amusements But what is profitable to every mortal, and in common life, when once discovered, can scarcely fall into oblivion, but by the total subversion of society, and by such furious inundations of barbarous invaders, as obliterate all memory of former arts and civility Imitation also is apt to transport these coarser and more useful arts from one climate to another, and make them precede the refined arts in their progress, though, perhaps, they sprang after them in their first rise and propagation From these causes proceed civilized monarchies, where the arts of government, first invented in free states, are preserved to the mutual advantage and security of sovereign and subject

However perfect, therefore, the monarchical form may appear to some politicians, it owes all its perfection to the republican, nor is it possible, that a pure despotism, established among a barbarous people, can ever, by its native force and energy, refine and polish itself It must borrow its laws, and methods, and institutions, and consequently its stability and order, from free governments. These advantages are the sole growth of republics The extensive despotism of a barbarous monarchy, by entering into the detail of the government, as well as into the principal points of administration, for ever prevents all such improvements

In a civilized monarchy, the prince alone is unrestrained in the exercise of his authority, and possesses alone a power, which is not bounded by anything but custom, example, and the sense of his own interest Every minister or magistrate, however eminent, must submit to the general laws which govern the whole society, and must exert the authority delegated to him after the manner which is prescribed. The people depend on none but their sovereign, for the security of their property He is so far removed from them, and is so much exempt from private jealousies or interests, that this dependence is scarcely felt And thus a species of government arises, to which, in a high political rant, we may give the name of *Tyranny*, but which, by a just and prudent administration, may afford tolerable security to the people, and may answer most of the ends of political society

But though in a civilized monarchy, as well as in a republic, the people have security for the enjoyment of their property, yet in both these forms of government, those who possess the supreme authority have the disposal of many honours and advantages, which excite the ambition and avarice of mankind. The only difference is, that, in a

republic, the candidates for office must look downwards to gain the suffrages of the people; in a monarchy, they must turn their attention upwards, to court the good graces and favour of the great. To be successful in the former way, it is necessary for a man to make himself *useful*, by his industry, capacity, or knowledge: to be prosperous in the latter way it is requisite for him to render himself *agreeable*, by his wit, complaisance, or civility. A strong genius succeeds best in republics: a refined taste in monarchies. And, consequently, the sciences are the more natural growth of the one, and the polite arts of the other.

Not to mention, that monarchies, receiving their chief stability from a superstitious reverence to priests and princes, have commonly abridged the liberty of reasoning, with regard to religion and politics, and consequently metaphysics and morals. All these form the most considerable branches of science. Mathematics and natural philosophy, which only remain, are not half so valuable.

Among the arts of conversation, no one pleases more than mutual deference or civility, which leads us to resign our own inclinations to those of our companion, and to curb and conceal that presumption and arrogance, so natural to the human mind. A good-natured man, who is well educated, practices this civility to every mortal, without premeditation or interest. But in order to render that valuable quality general among any people, it seems necessary to assist the natural disposition by some general motive. Where power rises upwards from the people to the great, as in all republics, such refinements of civility are apt to be little practised; since the whole state is, by that means, brought near to a level, and every member of it is rendered, in a great measure, independent of another. The people have the advantage, by the authority of their suffrages; the great by the superiority of their station. But in a civilized monarchy, there is a long train of dependence from the prince to the peasant, which is not great enough to render property precarious, or depress the minds of the people; but is sufficient to beget in every one an inclination to please his superiors, and to form himself upon those models, which are most acceptable to people of condition and education. Politeness of manners, therefore, arises most naturally in monarchies and courts; and where that flourishes, none of the liberal arts will be altogether neglected or despised.

The republics in Europe are at present noted for want of politeness. *The good manners of a Swiss civilized in* Holland*, is an expression for rusticity among the French. The English, in some degree, fall under the same censure, notwithstanding their learning and genius. And if the Venetians be an exception to the rule, they owe it, perhaps,

* C'est la politesse d'un Suisse En Hollande civilisé.—ROUSSEAU

to their communication with the other Italians, most of whose governments beget a dependence more than sufficient for civilizing their manners.

It is difficult to pronounce any judgment concerning the refinements of the ancient republics in this particular but I am apt to suspect, that the arts of conversation were not brought so near to perfection among them as the arts of writing and composition. The scurrility of the ancient orators, in many instances, is quite shocking, and exceeds all belief Vanity too is often not a little offensive in authors of those ages*, as well as the common licentiousness and immodesty of their style *Quicunque impudicus, adulter, ganeo, manu, ventre,* pene, *bona patria laceraverat,* says Sallust in one of the gravest and most moral passages of his history *Nam fuit ante Helenam Cunnus, teterrima belli causa,* is an expression of Horace, in tracing the origin of moral good and evil Ovid and Lucretius† are almost as licentious in their style as Lord Rochester, though the former were fine gentlemen and delicate writers, and the latter, from the corruptions of that court in which he lived seems to have thrown off all regard to shame and decency Juvenal inculcates modesty with great zeal, but sets a very bad example of it, if we consider the impudence of his expressions

I shall also be bold to affirm, that among the ancients, there was not much delicacy of breeding, or that polite deference and respect, which civility obliges us either to express or counterfeit towards the persons with whom we converse Cicero was certainly one of the finest gentlemen of his age yet I must confess I have frequently been shocked with the poor figure under which he represents his friend Atticus, in those dialogues, where he himself is introduced as a speaker That learned and virtuous Roman, whose dignity, though he was only a private gentleman, was inferior to that of no one in Rome, is there shown in rather a more pitiful light than Philalethes's friend in our modern dialogues He is a humble admirer of the orator, pays him frequent compliments, and receives his instructions, with all the deference which a scholar owes to his master‡ Even Cato is treated in somewhat of a cavalier manner in the dialogues *De Finibus*

One of the most particular details of a real dialogue, which we meet with in antiquity, is related by Polybius (Lib xvii), when Philip king of Macedon, a prince of wit and parts, met with Titus Flamininus, one

* It is needless to cite Cicero or Pliny on this head they are too much noted But one is a little surprised to find Arrian, a very grave, judicious writer interrupt the thread of his narration all of a sudden, to tell his readers that he himself is as eminent among the Greeks for eloquence, as Alexander was for arms – *Lib i*

† This poet (see lib iv 1165) recommends a very extraordinary cure for love, and what one expects not to meet with in so elegant and philosophical a poem. It seems to have been the original of some of Dr Swift's images The elegant Catullus and Phædrus fall under the same censure.

‡ ATT Non mihi videtur ad beate vivendum satis esse virtutem. MAR. At hercule Bruto meo videtur, cujus ego judicium, pace tua dixerim, longe antepono tuo.—*Tusc Quæst lib.* v.

of the politest of the Romans, as we learn from Plutarch (in Vita Flamin), accompanied with ambassadors from almost all the Greek cities. The Ætolian ambassador very abruptly tells the king, that he talked like a fool or a madman (ληρειν). 'That's evident, (says his Majesty), even to a blind man,' which was a raillery on the blindness of his excellency Yet all this did not pass the usual bounds for the conference was not disturbed, and Flamininus was very well diverted with these strokes of humour At the end, when Philip craved a little time to consult with this friends, of whom he had none present, the Roman general, being desirous also to show his wit, as the historian says, tells him, 'That perhaps the reason why he had none of his friends with him, was because he had murdered them all,' which was actually the case This unprovoked piece of rusticity is not condemned by the historian, caused no farther resentment in Philip, than to excite a Sardonian smile, or what we called a grin, and hindered him not from renewing the conference next day Plutarch, (in Vita Flamin) too, mentions this raillery amongst the witty and the agreeable sayings of Flamininus

Cardinal Wolsey apologised for his famous piece of insolence, in saying, EGO ET REX MEUS, *I and my king* by observing, that this expression was conformable to the *Latin* idiom, and that a Roman always named himself before the person to whom, or of whom, he spake Yet this seems to have been an instance of want of civility among that people The ancients made it a rule, that the person of the greatest dignity should be mentioned first in the discourse, insomuch, that we find the spring of a quarrel and jealousy between the Romans and Ætolians, to have been a poet's naming the Ætolians before the Romans in celebrating a victory gained by their united arms over the Macedonians (In Vit Flamin) Livia disgusted Tiberius by placing her own name before his in an inscription (Tacit Ann lib iii cap 64)

No advantages in this world are pure and unmixed In like manner, as modern politeness, which is naturally so ornamental, runs often into affectation and foppery, disguise and insincerity, so the ancient simplicity, which is naturally so amiable and affecting, often degenerates into rusticity and abuse, scurrility and obscenity

If the superiority in politeness should be allowed to modern times, the modern notions of *gallantry*, the natural produce of courts and monarchies, will probably be assigned as the causes of this refinement No one denies this invention to be modern * but some of the more zealous partizans of the ancients have asserted it to be foppish and ridiculous, and a reproach, rather than a credit, to the present age. (Lord Shaftesbury, see his *Moralists*) It may here be proper to examine this question.

* In the *Self-Tormentor* of Terence, Clinias, whenever he comes to town, instead of waiting on his mistress, sends for her to come to him.

Nature has implanted in all living creatures an affection between the sexes, which, even in the fiercest and most rapacious animals, is not merely confined to the satisfaction of the bodily appetite, but begets a friendship and mutual sympathy, which runs through the whole tenor of their lives. Nay, even in those species, where nature limits the indulgence of this appetite to one season and to one object, and forms a kind of marriage or association between a single male and female, there is yet a visible complacency and benevolence, which extends farther, and mutually softens the affections of the sexes towards each other. How much more must this have place in man, where the confinement of the appetite is not natural, but either is derived accidentally from some strong charm of love, or arises from reflections on duty and convenience. Nothing, therefore can proceed less from affectation than the passion of gallantry. It is *natural* in the highest degree. Art and education, in the most elegant courts, make no more alteration on it than on all the other laudable passions. They only turn the mind more towards it; they refine it; they polish it; and give it a proper grace and expression.

But gallantry is as *generous* as it is *natural*. To correct such gross vices, as lead us to commit real injury on others, is the part of morals, and the object of the most ordinary education. Where *that* is not attended to, in some degree, no human society can subsist. But, in order to render conversation, and the intercourse of minds more easy and agreeable, good manners have been invented, and have carried the matter somewhat farther. Wherever nature has given the mind a propensity to any vice, or to any passion disagreeable to others, refined breeding has taught men to throw the bias on the opposite side, and to preserve, in all their behaviour, the appearance of sentiments different from those to which they naturally incline. Thus as we are commonly proud and selfish, and apt to assume the preference above others, a polite man learns to behave with deference towards his companions, and to yield the superiority to them in all the common incidents of society. In like manner, wherever a person's situation may naturally beget any disagreeable suspicion in him, it is the part of good manners to prevent it, by a studied display of sentiments, directly contrary to those of which he is apt to be jealous. Thus, old men know their infirmities, and naturally dread contempt from the youth: hence well-educated youth redouble the instances of respect and deference to their elders. Strangers and foreigners are without protection: hence, in all polite countries, they receive the highest civilities, and are entitled to the first place in every company. A man is lord in his own family; and his guests are, in a manner, subject to his own authority: hence, he is always the lowest person in the company; attentive to the wants of every one; and giving himself all the trouble, in order to please, which may not betray too visible

an affectation, or impose too much constraint on his guests* Gallantry is nothing but an instance of the same generous attention As nature has given *man* the superiority above *woman*, by endowing him with greater strength both of mind and body, it is his part to alleviate that superiority, as much as possible, by the generosity of his behaviour, and by a studied deference and complaisance for all her inclinations and opinions Barbarous nations display this superiority, by reducing their females to the most abject slavery, by confining them, by beating them, by selling them, by killing them But the male sex, among a polite people, discover their authority in a more generous, though not a less evident manner, by civility, by respect, by complaisance, and, in a word, by gallantry In good company, you need not ask, who is the master of the feast? The man who sits in the lowest place, and who is always industrious in helping every one, is certainly the person We must either condemn all such instances of generosity, as foppish and affected, or admit of gallantry among the rest The ancient Muscovites wedded their wives with a whip, instead of a ring The same people, in their own houses, took always the precedency above foreigners, even† foreign ambassadors These two instances of their generosity and politeness are much of a piece

Gallantry is not less compatible with *wisdom* and *prudence*, than with *nature* and *generosity*, and, when under proper regulations, contributes more than any other invention to the *entertainment* and *improvement* of the youth of both sexes Among every species of animals, nature has founded on the love between the sexes their sweetest and best enjoyment But the satisfaction of the bodily appetite is not alone sufficient to gratify the mind and, even among brute creatures, we find that their play and dalliance, and other expressions of fondness, form the greatest part of the entertainment In rational beings, we must certainly admit the mind for a considerable share Were we to rob the feast of all its garniture of reason, discourse sympathy, friendship and gaiety, what remains would scarcely be worth acceptance, in the judgment of the truly elegant and luxurious

What better school for manners than the company of virtuous women, where the mutual endeavour to please must insensibly polish the mind, where the example of the female softness and modesty must communicate itself to their admirers, and where the delicacy of that sex puts every one on his guard lest he give offence by any breach of decency?

Among the ancients, the character of the fair sex was considered as altogether domestic, nor were they regarded as part of the polite

* The frequent mention in ancient authors of that ill-bred custom of the master of the family's eating better bread, or drinking better wine at table, than he afforded his guest is but an indifferent mark of the civility of those ages. Juvenal, sat. 5 Plin lib. xiv cap. 13 also Plinii *Epist* *Lucian de mercede conductis* *Saturnalia*, &c. There is scarcely any part of Europe at present so uncivilized as to admit of such a custom.

† *Relation of three Embassies*, by the Earl of Carlisle.

world, or of good company This, perhaps, is the true reason why the ancients have not left us one piece of pleasantry that is excellent (unless one may except the Banquet of Xenophon, and the Dialogues of Lucian), though many of their serious compositions are altogether inimitable Horace condemns the coarse railleries and cold jests of Plautus but, though the most easy, agreeable, and judicious writer in the world, is his own talent for ridicule very striking or refined? This, therefore, is one considerable improvement, which the polite arts have received from gallantry, and from courts where it first arose

But, to return from this digression, I shall advance it as a *fourth* observation on this subject, of the rise and progress of the arts and sciences, *that when the arts and sciences came to perfection in any state, from that moment they naturally or rather necessarily decline, and seldom or never revive in that nation, where they formerly flourished*

It must be confessed, that this maxim, though conformable to experience, may at first sight be esteemed contrary to reason If the natural genius of mankind be the same in all ages, and in almost all countries (as seems to be the truth), it must very much forward and cultivate this genius, to be possessed of patterns in every art, which may regulate the taste, and fix the objects of imitation The models left us by the ancients gave birth to all the arts about 200 years ago, and have mightily advanced their progress in every country of Europe why had they not a like effect during the reign of Trajan and his successors, when they were much more entire, and were still admired and studied by the whole world? So late as the emperor Justinian, the Poet, by way of distinction, was understood, among the Greeks, to be Homer, among the Romans Virgil Such admirations still remained for these divine geniuses, though no poet had appeared for many centuries, who could justly pretend to have imitated them

A man's genius is always, in the beginning of life, as much unknown to himself as to others and it is only after frequent trials, attended with success, that he dares think himself equal to those undertakings, in which those, who have succeeded, have fixed the admiration of mankind If his own nation be already possessed of many models of eloquence, he naturally compares his own juvenile exercises with these, and being sensible of the great disproportion, is discouraged from any farther attempts, and never aims at a rivalship with those authors, whom he so much admires A noble emulation is the source of every excellence Admiration and modesty naturally extinguish this emulation. And no one is so liable to an excess of admiration and modesty as a truly great genius.

Next to emulation, the greatest encourager of the noble arts is praise and glory. A writer is animated with new force, when he hears the applause of the world for his former productions, and, being roused by such a motive, he often reaches a pitch of perfection, which is

equally surprising to himself and to his readers. But when the posts of honour are all occupied, his first attempts are but coldly received by the public, being compared to productions, which are both in themselves more excellent, and have already the advantage of an established reputation. Were Moliere and Corneille to bring upon the stage at present their early productions, which were formerly so well received, it would discourage the young poets, to see the indifference and disdain of the public The ignorance of the age alone could have given admission to the *Prince of Tyre*, but it is to that we owe *The Moor* had *Every Man in his Humour* been rejected, we had never seen *Volpone*

Perhaps, it may not be for the advantage of any nation to have the arts imported from their neighbours in too great perfection This extinguishes emulation, and sinks the ardour of the generous youth So many models of Italian painting brought to England, instead of exciting our artists, is the cause of their small progress in that noble art The same, perhaps, was the case of Rome, when it received the arts from Greece That multitude of polite productions in the French language, dispersed all over Germany and the North, hinder these nations from cultivating their own language, and keep them still dependent on their neighbours for those elegant entertainments.

It is true the ancients had left us models in every kind of writing, which are highly worthy of admiration But besides that they were written in languages, known only to the learned, besides this, I say, the comparison is not so perfect or entire between modern wits, and those who lived in so remote an age Had Waller been born in Rome, during the reign of Tiberius, his first productions had been despised, when compared to the finished odes of Horace But in this island the superiority of the Roman poet diminished nothing from the fame of the English We esteemed ourselves sufficiently happy, that our climate and language could produce but a faint copy of so excellent an original

In short, the arts and sciences, like some plants, require a fresh soil, and however rich the land may be, and however you may recruit it by art or care, it will never, when once exhausted, produce any thing that is perfect or finished in the kind

XIV.—THE EPICUREAN, OR, THE MAN OF ELEGANCE AND PLEASURE*

It is a great mortification to the vanity of man, that his utmost art and industry can never equal the meanest of Nature's productions,

* The intention of this and the three following Essays is not so much to explain accurately

either for beauty or value. Art is only the under-workman, and is employed to give a few strokes of embellishment to those pieces which come from the hand of the master. Some of the drapery may be of his drawing; but he is not allowed to touch the principal figure. Art may make a suit of clothes: but nature must produce a man.

Even in those productions, commonly denominated works of art, we find that the noblest of the kind are beholden for their chief beauty to the force and happy influence of nature. To the native enthusiasm of the poets, we owe whatever is admirable in their productions. The greatest genius, where nature at any time fails him, (for she is not equal), throws aside the lyre, and hopes not, from the rules of art, to reach that divine harmony, which must proceed from her inspiration alone. How poor are those songs, where a happy flow of fancy has not furnished materials for art to embellish and refine!

But of all the fruitless attempts of art, no one is so ridiculous, as that which the severe philosophers have undertaken, the producing of an *artificial happiness*, and making us be pleased by rules of reason, and by reflection. Why did none of them claim the reward, which Xerxes promised to him who should invent a new pleasure? Unless, perhaps, they invented so many pleasures for their own use, that they despised riches, and stood in no need of any enjoyments, which the rewards of that monarch could procure them. I am apt, indeed, to think, that they were not willing to furnish the Persian court with a new pleasure, by presenting it with so new and unusual an object of ridicule. Their speculations, when confined to theory, and gravely delivered in the schools of Greece, might excite admiration in their ignorant pupils: but the attempting to reduce such principles to practice would soon have betrayed their absurdity.

You pretend to make me happy by reason and by rules of art. You must, then, create me anew by rules of art. For on my original frame and structure does my happiness depend. But you want power to effect this; and skill too, I am afraid: nor can I entertain a less opinion of nature's wisdom than of yours. And let her conduct the machine, which she has so wisely framed; I find that I should only spoil it by tampering.

To what purpose should I pretend to regulate, refine, or invigorate any of those springs or principles, which nature has implanted in me? Is this the road by which I must reach happiness? But happiness implies ease, contentment, repose, and pleasure; not watchfulness, care, and fatigue. The health of my body consists in the facility with which all its operations are performed. The stomach digests the

the sentiments of the ancient sects of philosophy, as to deliver the sentiments of sects that naturally form themselves in the world, and entertain different ideas of human life and happiness. I have given each of them the name of the philosophical sect, to which it bears the greatest affinity.

aliments: the heart circulates the blood: the brain separates and refines the spirits: and all this without my concerning myself in the matter. When by my will alone I can stop the blood, as it runs with impetuosity along its canals, then may I hope to change the course of my sentiments and passions. In vain should I strain my faculties, and endeavour to receive pleasure from an object, which is not fitted by nature to affect my organs with delight. I may give myself pain by my fruitless endeavours, but shall never reach any pleasure.

Away then with all those vain pretences of making ourselves happy within ourselves, of feasting on our own thoughts, of being satisfied with the consciousness of well doing, and of despising all assistance and all supplies from external objects. This is the voice of Pride, not of Nature. And it were well if even this pride could support itself, and communicate a real *inward* pleasure, however melancholy or severe. But this impotent pride can do no more than regulate the *outside*, and with infinite pains and attention compose the language and countenance to a philosophical dignity, in order to deceive the ignorant vulgar. The heart, meanwhile, is empty of all enjoyment: and the mind, unsupported by its proper objects, sinks into the deepest sorrow and dejection. Miserable, but vain mortal! Thy mind be happy within itself! With what resources is it endowed to fill so immense a void, and supply the place of all thy bodily senses and faculties? Can thy head subsist without thy other members? In such a situation,

What foolish figure must it make?
Do nothing else but sleep *and* ake.

Into such a lethargy, or such a melancholy, must thy mind be plunged, when deprived of foreign occupations and enjoyments.

Keep me, therefore, no longer in this violent constraint. Confine me not within myself; but point out to me those objects and pleasures which afford the chief enjoyment. But why do I apply to you, proud and ignorant sages, to shew me the road to happiness? Let me consult my own passions and inclinations. In them must I read the dictates of nature, not in your frivolous discourses.

But see propitious to my wishes, the divine, the amiable PLEASURE, [*Dia Voluptas.* LUCRET.] the supreme love of GODS and men, advances towards me. At her approach, my heart beats with genial heat, and every sense and every faculty is dissolved in joy, while she pours around me all the embellishments of the spring, and all the treasures of the autumn. The melody of her voice charms my ears with the softest music, as she invites me to partake of those delicious fruits, which, with a smile that diffuses a glory on the heavens and the earth, she presents to me. The sportive Cupids, who attend her, or fan me with their odoriferous wings, or pour on my head the most fragrant oils, or offer me their sparkling nectar in golden goblets. O!

for ever let me spread my limbs on this bed of roses, and thus, thus feel the delicious moments, with soft and downy steps, glide along. But, cruel chance! Whither do you fly so fast? Why do my ardent wishes, and that load of pleasures, under which you labour, rather hasten than retard your unrelenting pace. Suffer me to enjoy this soft repose, after all my fatigues in search of happiness Suffer me to satiate myself with these delicacies, after the pains of so long and so foolish an abstinence

But it will not do The roses have lost their hue the fruit its flavour and that delicious wine, whose fumes so late intoxicated all my senses with such delight, now solicits in vain the sated palate. *Pleasure* smiles at my languor She beckons her sister, *Virtue*, to come to her assistance The gay, the frolic *Virtue*, observes the call and brings along the whole troop of my jovial friends Welcome thrice welcome, my ever dear companions, to these shadow bowers, and to this luxurious repast Your presence has restored to the rose its hue, and to the fruit its flavour The vapours of this sprightly nectar now again play around my heart, while you partake of my delights and discover, in your cheerful looks, the pleasure which you receive from my happiness and satisfaction The like do I receive from yours, and, encouraged by your joyous presence, shall again renew the feast, with which, from too much enjoyment, my senses are well nigh sated, while the mind kept not pace with the body, nor afforded relief to her o'erburthened partner

In our cheerful discourses, better than in the formal reasoning of the schools, is true wisdom to be found In our friendly endearments, better than in the hollow debates of statesmen and pretended patriots, does true virtue display itself Forgetful of the past, secure of the future, let us here enjoy the present, and while we yet possess a being, let us fix some good, beyond the power of fate or fortune To-morrow will bring its own pleasures along with it or, should it disappoint our fond wishes, we shall at least enjoy the pleasure of reflecting on the pleasures of to-day

Fear not, my friends, that the barbarous dissonance of Bacchus, and of his revellers, should break in upon this entertainment, and confound us with their turbulent and clamorous pleasures. The sprightly muses wait around, and with their charming symphony, sufficient to soften the wolves and tigers of the savage desert, inspire a soft joy into every bosom Peace, harmony, and concord, reign in this retreat; nor is the silence ever broken but by the music of our songs, or the cheerful accents of our friendly voices.

But hark! the favourite of the muses, the gentle Damon strikes the lyre, and, while he accompanies its harmonious notes with his more harmonious song, he inspires us with the same happy debauch of fancy, by which he is himself transported. 'Ye happy youths,' he sings,

'Ye favoured of Heaven*, while the wanton spring pours upon you all her blooming honours, let not *glory* seduce you, with her delusive blaze, to pass in perils and dangers this delicious season, this prime of life. Wisdom points out to you the road to pleasure nature too beckons you to follow her in that smooth and flowery path. Will you shut your ears to their commanding voice? Will you harden your heart to their soft allurements? Oh, deluded mortals! thus to lose your youth, thus to throw away so invaluable a present, to trifle with so perishing a blessing Contemplate well your recompense Consider that glory, which so allures your proud hearts, and seduces you with your own praises It is an echo, a dream, nay the shadow of a dream, dissipated by every wind, and lost by every contrary breath of the ignorant and ill-judging multitude You fear not that even death itself shall ravish it from you But behold! while you are yet alive, calumny bereaves you of it, ignorance neglects it, nature enjoys it not, fancy alone, renouncing every pleasure, receives this airy recompense, empty and unstable as herself'

Thus the hours pass unperceived along, and lead in their wanton train all the pleasures of sense, and all the joys of harmony and friendship Smiling *innocence* closes the procession, and, while she presents herself to our ravished eyes, she embellishes the whole scene, and renders the view of these pleasures as transporting, after they have past us, as when, with laughing countenances, they were yet advancing towards us

But the sun has sunk below the horizon and darkness, stealing silently upon us, has now buried all nature in an universal shade. 'Rejoice, my friends, continue your repast, or change it for soft repose Though absent, your joy or your tranquillity shall still be mine' *But whither do you go? Or what new pleasures call you from our society? Is there aught agreeable without your friends? And can aught please in which we partake not?* 'Yes, my friend, the joy which I now seek, admits not of your participation Here alone I wish your absence and here alone can I find a sufficient compensation for the loss of your society'

But I have not advanced far through the shades of the thick wood, which spreads a double night around me, ere methinks, I perceive through the gloom the charming Caelia, the mistress of my wishes, who wanders impatient through the grove, and, preventing the appointed hour, silently chides my tardy steps But the joy, which she receives from my presence, best pleads my excuse, and, dissipating every anxious and every angry thought, leaves room for nought but mutual joy and rapture. With what words, my fair one, shall I ex

* An imitation of the Syren's song in Tasso

'O Giovinetti, mentre Aprile et Maggio V'ammantan di fiorite et verde spoglie,' &c.
—*Gierusalemme liberata, Canto* 14.

press my tenderness, or describe the emotions which now warm my transported bosom! Words are too faint to describe my love; and if, alas! you feel not the same flame within you, in vain shall I endeavour to convey to you a just conception of it. But your every word and every motion suffice to remove this doubt; and while they express your passion, serve also to inflame mine. How amiable this solitude, this silence, this darkness! No objects now importune the ravished soul. The thought, the sense, all full of nothing but our mutual happiness, wholly possess the mind, and convey a pleasure, which deluded mortals vainly seek for in every other enjoyment.——

But why does your bosom heave with these sighs, while tears bathe your glowing cheeks? Why distract your heart with such vain anxieties? Why so often ask me, *How long my love shall yet endure?* Alas! my Cælia, can I resolve this question? *Do I know how long my life shall yet endure?* But does this also disturb your tender breast? And is the image of our frail mortality for ever present with you, to throw a damp on your gayest hours, and poison even those joys which love inspires? Consider rather, that if life be frail, if youth be transitory, we should well employ the present moment, and lose no part of so perishable an existence. Yet a little moment, and *these* shall be no more. We shall be, as if we had never been. Not a memory of us be left upon earth; and even the fabulous shades below will not afford us a habitation. Our fruitless anxieties, our vain projects, our uncertain speculations, shall all be swallowed up and lost. Our present doubts, concerning the original cause of all things, must never, alas! be resolved. This alone we may be certain of, that if any governing mind preside, he must be pleased to see us fulfil the ends of our being, and enjoy that pleasure, for which alone we were created. Let this reflection give ease to your anxious thoughts; but render not your joys too serious, by dwelling for ever upon it. It is sufficient, once to be acquainted with this philosophy, in order to give an unbounded loose to love and jollity, and remove all the scruples of a vain superstition: but while youth and passion, my fair one, prompt our eager desires, we must find gayer subjects of discourse, to intermix with these amorous caresses.

XV.—THE STOIC, OR, THE MAN OF ACTION AND VIRTUE.

THERE is this obvious and material difference in the conduct of nature, with regard to men and other animals, that, having endowed the former with a sublime celestial spirit, and having given him an

affinity with superior beings, she allows not such noble faculties to lie lethargic or idle, but urges him by necessity, to employ, on every emergence, his utmost *art* and *industry* Brute-creatures have many of their necessities supplied by nature, being clothed and armed by this beneficent parent of all things and where their own *industry* is requisite on any occasion, nature, by implanting instincts, still supplies them with the *art* and guides them to their good by her unerring precepts But man, exposed naked and indigent to the rude elements, rises slowly from that helpless state, by the care and vigilance of his parents, and, having attained his utmost growth and perfection, reaches only a capacity of subsisting, by his own care and vigilance Every thing is sold to skill and labour, and where nature furnishes the materials, they are still rude and unfinished, till industry, ever active and intelligent refines them from their brute state, and fits them for human use and convenience

Acknowledge, therefore, O man! the beneficence of nature, for she has given thee that intelligence which supplies all thy necessities But let not indolence, under the false appearance of gratitude, persuade thee to rest contented with her presents Wouldst thou return to the raw herbage for thy food, to the open sky for thy covering, and to stones and clubs for thy defence against the ravenous animals of the desert? Then return also to thy savage manners, to thy timorous superstition to thy brutal ignorance and sink thyself below those animals, whose condition thou admirest, and wouldst so fondly imitate

Thy kind parent, nature, having given thee art and intelligence, has filled the whole globe with materials to employ these talents hearken to her voice, which so plainly tells thee, that thou thyself shouldst also be the object of thy industry, and that by art and attention alone thou canst acquire that ability which will raise thee to thy proper station in the universe Behold this artizan who converts a rude and shapeless stone into a noble metal, and, moulding that metal by his cunning hands, creates, as it were by magic, every weapon for his defence and every utensil for his convenience He has not this skill from nature Use and practice have taught it him and if thou wouldst emulate his success, thou must follow his laborious footsteps

But whilst thou *ambitiously* aspirest to perfecting thy bodily powers and faculties, wouldst thou *meanly* neglect thy mind, and, from a preposterous sloth, leave it still rude and uncultivated, as it came from the hands of nature? Far be such folly and negligence from every rational being If nature has been frugal in her gifts and endowments, there is the more need of art to supply her defects If she has been generous and liberal, know that she still expects industry and application on our part, and revenges herself in proportion to our negligent ingratitude. The richest genius, like the most fertile soil, when

uncultivated, shoots up into the rankest weeds: and instead of vines and olives for the pleasure and use of man, produces, to its slothful owner, the most abundant crop of poisons.

The great end of all human industry, is the attainment of happiness. For this were arts invented sciences cultivated, laws ordained, and societies modelled, by the most profound wisdom of patriots and legislators Even the lonely savage, who lies exposed to the inclemency of the elements, and the fury of wild beasts, forgets not, for a moment, this grand object of his being Ignorant as he is of every art of life, he still keeps in view the end of all those arts, and eagerly seeks for felicity amidst that darkness with which he is environed But as much as the wildest savage is inferior to the polished citizen, who, under the protection of laws, enjoys every convenience which industry has invented, so much is this citizen himself inferior to the man of virtue, and the true philosopher, who governs his appetites, subdues his passions, and has learned, from reason, to set a just value on every pursuit and enjoyment For is there an art and apprenticeship necessary for every other attainment? And is there no art of life, no rule, no precepts to direct us in this principal concern? Can no particular pleasure be attained without skill, and can the whole be regulated, without reflection or intelligence by the blind guidance of appetite and instinct? Surely then no mistakes are ever committed in this affair, but every man, however dissolute and negligent, proceeds in the pursuit of happiness with as unerring a motion, as that which the celestial bodies observe, when conducted by the hand of the Almighty, they roll along the ethereal plains But if mistakes be often, be inevitably committed, let us register these mistakes, let us consider their causes let us weigh their importance, let us inquire for their remedies When from this we have fixed all the rules of conduct, we are *philosophers* When we have reduced these rules to practice, we are *sages*

Like many subordinate artists, employed to form the several wheels and springs of a machine such are those who excel in all the particular arts of life *He* is the master workman who puts those several parts together, moves them according to just harmony and proportion and produces true felicity as the result of their conspiring order

While thou hast such an alluring object in view, shall that labour and attention, requisite to the attainment of thy end, ever seem burdensome and intolerable? Know, that this labour itself is the chief ingredient of the felicity to which thou aspirest, and that every enjoyment soon becomes insipid and distasteful, when not acquired by fatigue and industry See the hardy hunters rise from their downy couches, shake off the slumbers which still weigh down their heavy eye-lids, and ere *Aurora* has yet covered the heavens with her

flaming mantle, hasten to the forest. They leave behind, in their own houses, and in the neighbouring plains, animals of every kind whose flesh furnishes the most delicious fare, and which offer themselves to the fatal stroke. Laborious man disdains so easy a purchase. He seeks for a prey, which hides itself from his search, or flies from his pursuits, or defends itself from his violence. Having exerted in the chase every passion of the mind, and every member of the body, he then finds the charms of repose, and with joy compares his pleasures to those of his engaging labours.

And can vigorous industry give pleasure to the pursuit even of the most worthless prey, which frequently escapes our toils? And cannot the same industry render the cultivating of our mind, the moderating of our passions, the enlightening of our reason, an agreeable occupation; while we are every day sensible of our progress, and behold our inward features and countenance brightening incessantly with new charms? Begin by curing yourself of this lethargic indolence; the task is not difficult: you need but taste the sweets of honest labour. Proceed to learn the just value of every pursuit; long study is not requisite: compare though but for once, the mind to the body, virtue to fortune, and glory to pleasure. You will then perceive the advantages of industry: you will then be sensible what are the proper objects of your industry.

In vain do you seek repose from beds of roses: in vain do you hope for enjoyment from the most delicious wines and fruits. Your indolence itself creates disgust. The mind, unexercised, finds every delight insipid and loathsome; and ere yet the body, full of noxious humours, feels the torment of its multiplied diseases, your nobler part is sensible of the invading poison, and seeks in vain to relieve its anxiety by new pleasures, which still augment the fatal malady.

I need not tell you, that, by this eager pursuit of pleasure, you more and more expose yourself to fortune and accidents, and rivet your affections on external objects, which chance may, in a moment, ravish from you. I shall suppose that your indulgent stars favour you still with the enjoyment of your riches and possessions. I prove to you, that even in the midst of your luxurious pleasures, you are unhappy; and that, by too much indulgence, you are incapable of enjoying what prosperous fortune still allows you to possess.

But surely the instability of fortune is a consideration not to be overlooked or neglected. Happiness cannot possibly exist, where there is no security; and security can have no place, where fortune has any dominion. Though that unstable deity should not exert her rage against you, the dread of it would still torment you; would disturb your slumbers, haunt your dreams, and throw a damp on the jollity of your most delicious banquets.

The temple of wisdom is seated on a rock, above the rage

of the fighting elements, and inaccessible to all the malice of man. The rolling thunder breaks below, and those more terrible instruments of human fury reach not to so sublime a height The sage, while he breathes that serene air, looks down with pleasure, mixed with compassion, on the errors of mistaken mortals, who blindly seek for the true path of life, and pursue riches, nobility, honour, or power, for genuine felicity The greater part he beholds disappointed of their fond wishes some lament, that having once possessed the object of their desires, it is ravished from them by envious fortune, and all complain, that even their own vows, though granted, cannot give them happiness, or relieve the anxiety of their distracted minds

But does the sage always preserve himself in this philosophical indifference, and rest contented with lamenting the miseries of mankind, without ever employing himself for their relief? Does he constantly indulge this severe wisdom, which, by pretending to elevate him above human accidents, does in reality harden his heart, and render him careless of the interests of mankind, and of society? No, he knows that in this sullen *Apathy* neither true wisdom nor true happiness can be found He feels too strongly the charm of the social affections, ever to counteract so sweet so natural, so virtuous a propensity Even when, bathed in tears, he laments the miseries of the human race, of his country of his friends, and unable to give succour, can only relieve them by compassion, he yet rejoices in the generous disposition, and feels a satisfaction superior to that of the most indulged sense So engaging are the sentiments of humanity that they brighten up the very face of sorrow, and operate like the sun, which, shining on a dusky cloud or falling rain, paints on them the most glorious colours which are to be found in the whole circle of nature

But it is not here alone, that the social virtues display their energy With whatever ingredient you mix them, they are still predominant As sorrow cannot overcome them, so neither can sensual pleasure obscure them The joys of love, however tumultuous, banish not the tender sentiments of sympathy and affection They even derive their chief influence from that generous passion, and when presented alone, afford nothing to the unhappy mind but lassitude and disgust Behold this sprightly debauchee, who professes a contempt of all other pleasures but those of wine and jollity separate him from his companions, like a spark from a fire, where before it contributed to the general blaze, his alacrity suddenly extinguishes, and, though surrounded with every other means of delight, he lothes the sumptuous banquet, and prefers even the most abstracted study and speculation, as more agreeable and entertaining

But the social passions never afford such transporting pleasures, or make so glorious an appearance in the eyes both of GOD and man, as

when, shaking off every earthly mixture, they associate themselves with the sentiments of virtue, and prompt us to laudable and worthy actions. As harmonious colours mutually give and receive a lustre by their friendly union, so do these ennobling sentiments of the human mind. See the triumph of nature in parental affection! What selfish passion, what sensual delight is a match for it! Whether a man exults in the prosperity and virtue of his offspring, or flies to their succour, through the most threatening and tremendous dangers?

Proceed still in purifying the generous passion, you will still the more admire its shining glories. What charms are there in the harmony of minds, and in a friendship founded on mutual esteem and gratitude! What satisfaction in relieving the distressed, in comforting the afflicted, in raising the fallen, and in stopping the career of cruel fortune, or of more cruel man, in their insults over the good and virtuous! But what supreme joy in the victories over vice as well as misery, when, by virtuous example or wise exhortation, our fellow-creatures are taught to govern their passions, reform their vices, and subdue their worst enemies, which inhabit within their own bosoms!

But these objects are still too limited for the human mind which, being of celestial origin, swells with the divinest and most enlarged affections, and, carrying its attention beyond kindred and acquaintance, extends its benevolent wishes to the most distant posterity. It views liberty and laws as the source of human happiness, and devotes itself, with the utmost alacrity, to their guardianship and protection. Toils, dangers, death itself, carry their charms, when we brave them for the public good, and ennoble that being, which we generously sacrifice for the interests of our country. Happy the man, whom indulgent fortune allows to pay to virtue what he owes to nature, and to make a generous gift of what must otherwise be ravished from him by cruel necessity.

In the true sage and patriot are united whatever can distinguish human nature, or elevate mortal man to a resemblance with the Divinity. The softest benevolence, the most undaunted resolution, the tenderest sentiments, the most sublime love of virtue, all these animate successively his transported bosom. What satisfaction, when he looks within, to find the most turbulent passions tuned to just harmony and concord, and every jarring sound banished from this enchanting music! If the contemplation, even of inanimate beauty, is so delightful, if it ravishes the senses, even when the fair form is foreign to us what must be the effects of moral beauty? And what influence must it have, when it embellishes our own mind, and is the result of our own reflection and industry?

But where is the reward of virtue? And what recompense has Nature provided for such important sacrifices, as those of life and fortune, which we must often make to it? Oh, sons of earth! Are ye

ignorant of the value of this celestial mistress? And do ye meanly inquire for her portion, when ye observe her genuine charms? But know, that Nature has been indulgent to human weakness, and has not left this favourite child naked and unendowed She has provided virtue with the richest dowry, but being careful, lest the allurements of interest should engage such suitors, as were insensible of the native worth of so divine a beauty, she has wisely provided, that this dowry can have no charms but in the eyes of those who are already transported with the loss of virtue Glory is the portion of virtue, the sweet reward of honourable toils, the triumphant crown which covers the thoughtful head of the disinterested patriot, or the dusty brow of the victorious warrior Elevated by so sublime a prize, the man of virtue looks down with contempt on all the allurements of pleasure, and all the menaces of danger Death itself loses its terrors, when he considers, that its dominion extends only over a part of him, and that, in spite of death and time, the rage of the elements and the endless vicissitude of human affairs, he is assured of an immortal fame among all the sons of men

There surely is a Being who presides over the universe, and who, with infinite wisdom and power, has reduced the jarring elements into just order and proportion Let reasoners dispute, how far this beneficent Being extends his care, and whether he prolongs our existence beyond the grave, in order to bestow on virtue its just reward, and render it fully triumphant The man of morals is satisfied with the portion marked out to him by the Supreme Disposer of all things Gratefully he accepts of that farther reward prepared for him, but if, disappointed, he thinks not virtue an empty name, but justly esteeming it its own reward, he gratefully acknowledges the bounty of his Creator, who, by calling him into existence, has thereby afforded him an opportunity of once acquiring so invaluable a possession.

XVI—THE PLATONIST, OR, THE MAN OF CONTEMPLATION, AND PHILOSOPHICAL DEVOTION.

To some philosophers it appears matter of surprise, that all mankind, possessing the same nature, and being endowed with the same faculties, should yet differ so widely in their pursuits and inclinations, and that one should utterly condemn what is fondly sought after by another. To some it appears matter of still more surprise, that a man should differ so widely from himself at different times, and, after possession, reject with disdain what, before, was the object of all his vows and

wishes. To me this feverish uncertainty and irresolution, in human conduct, seems altogether unavoidable; nor can a rational soul, made for the contemplation of the Supreme Being, and of his works, ever enjoy tranquility or satisfaction, while detained in the ignoble pursuits of sensual pleasure or popular applause. The Divinity is a boundless ocean of bliss and glory: human minds are smaller streams, which, arising at first from this ocean, seek still, amid all their wanderings, to return to it, and to lose themselves in that immensity of perfection. When checked in this natural course, by vice or folly, they become furious and enraged; and, swelling to a torrent, do then spread horror and devastation on the neighbouring plains.

In vain, by pompous phrase and passionate expression, each recommends his own pursuit, and invites the credulous hearers to an imitation of his life and manners. The heart belies the countenance, and sensibly feels, even amid the highest success, the unsatisfactory nature of all those pleasures which detain it from its true object. I examine the voluptuous man before enjoyment; I measure the vehemence of his desire, and the importance of his object; I find that all his happiness proceeds only from that hurry of thought, which takes him from himself, and turns his view from his guilt and misery. I consider him a moment after; he has now enjoyed the pleasure, which he fondly sought after. The sense of his guilt and misery returns upon him with double anguish: his mind tormented with fear and remorse; his body depressed with disgust and satiety.

But a more august, at least a more haughty personage, presents himself boldly to our censure; and, assuming the title of a philosopher and man of morals, offers to submit to the most rigid examination. He challenges, with a visible, though concealed impatience, our approbation and applause; and seems offended, that we should hesitate a moment before we break out into admiration of his virtue. Seeing this impatience, I hesitate still more; I begin to examine the motives of his seeming virtue: but behold! ere I can enter upon this inquiry, he flings himself from me; and, addressing his discourse to that crowd of heedless auditors, he fondly abuses them by his magnificent pretensions.

O philosopher! thy wisdom is vain, and thy virtue unprofitable. Thou seekest the ignorant applauses of men, not the solid reflections of thy own conscience, or the more solid approbation of that Being, who, with one regard of his all-seeing eye, penetrates the universe. Thou surely art conscious of the hollowness of thy pretended probity; whilst calling thyself a citizen, a son, a friend, thou forgettest thy higher sovereign, thy true father, thy greatest benefactor. Where is the adoration due to infinite perfection, whence every thing good and valuable is derived! Where is the gratitude, owing to thy Creator, who called thee forth from nothing, who placed thee in all these rela-

tions to thy fellow-creatures, and requiring thee to fulfil the duty of each relation, forbids thee to neglect what thou owest to himself, the most perfect being, to whom thou art connected by the closest tie?

But thou art thyself thy own idol thou worshippest thy *imaginary* perfections or rather, sensible of thy *real* imperfections, thou seekest only to deceive the world, and to please thy fancy, by multiplying thy ignorant admirers Thus, not content with neglecting what is most excellent in the universe, thou desirest to substitute in his place what is most vile and contemptible

Consider all the works of men's hands, all the inventions of human wit, in which thou affectest so nice a discernment thou wilt find, that the most perfect production still proceeds from the most perfect thought, and that it is MIND alone, which we admire, while we bestow our applause on the graces of a well proportioned statue, or the symmetry of a noble pile The statuary, the architect, come still in view, and makes us reflect on the beauty of his art and contrivance, which, from a heap of unformed matter, could extract such expressions and proportions This superior beauty of thought and intelligence thou thyself acknowledgest while thou invitest us to contemplate, in thy conduct, the harmony of affections, the dignity of sentiments, and all those graces of a mind, which chiefly merit our attention But why stoppest thou short? Seest thou nothing farther that is valuable? Amid thy rapturous applauses of beauty and order, art thou still ignorant where is to be found the most consummate beauty? the most perfect order? Compare the works of art with those of nature The one are but imitations of the other The nearer art approaches to nature, the more perfect is it esteemed But still, how wide are its nearest approaches and what an immense interval may be observed between them? Art copies only the outside of nature, leaving the inward and more admirable springs and principles, as exceeding her imitation as beyond her comprehension Art copies only the minute productions of nature despairing to reach that grandeur and magnificence, which are so astonishing in the masterly works of her original Can we then be so blind as not to discover an intelligence and a design in the exquisite and most stupendous contrivance of the universe? Can we be so stupid as not to feel the warmest raptures of worship and adoration, upon the contemplation of that intelligent Being, so *infinitely good and wise*?

The most perfect happiness, surely must arise from the contemplation of the most perfect object And where is beauty to be found equal to that of the universe? or virtue, which can be compared to the benevolence and justice of the Deity? If aught can diminish the pleasure of this contemplation, it must be either the narrowness of our faculties, which conceals from us the greatest part of these beauties and perfections, or the shortness of our lives, which allows not time

sufficient to instruct us in them. But it is our comfort, that, if we employ worthily the faculties here assigned us, they will be enlarged in another state of existence so as to render us more suitable worshippers of our Maker and that the task, which can never be finished in time, will be the busines of an eternity

XVII.—THE SCEPTIC.

I HAVE long entertained a suspicion, with regard to the decisions of philosophers upon all subjects, and found in myself a greater inclination to dispute than assent to their conclusions There is one mistake, to which they seem liable, almost without exception they confine too much their principles, and make no account of that vast variety, which nature has so much affected in all her operations When a philosopher has once laid hold of a favourite principle, which perhaps accounts for many natural effects, he extends the same principle over the whole creation, and reduces to it every phenomenon, though by the most violent and absurd reasoning Our own mind being narrow and contracted, we cannot extend our conception to the variety and extent of nature, but imagine, that she is as much bounded in her operations, as we are in our speculation

But if ever this infirmity of philosophers is to be suspected on any occasion, it is in their reasonings concerning human life and the methods of attaining happiness In that case, they are led astray, not only by the narrowness of their understandings but by that also of their passions Almost every one has a predominant inclination, to which his other desires and affections submit, and which governs him, though, perhaps, with some intervals, through the whole course of his life It is difficult for him to apprehend, that anything, which appears totally indifferent to him, can ever give enjoyment to any person, or can possess charms, which altogether escape his observation His own pursuits are always, in his account, the most engaging the objects of his passion, the most valuable and the road, which he pursues, the only one that leads to happiness

But would these prejudiced reasoners reflect a moment, there are many obvious instances and arguments, sufficient to undeceive them, and make them enlarge their maxims and principles Do they not see the vast variety of inclinations and pursuits among our species where each man seems fully satisfied with his own course of life and would esteem it the greatest unhappiness to be confined to that of his neighbour? Do they not feel in themselves that what pleases at one time

displeases at another, by the change of inclination; and that it is not in their power, by their utmost efforts, to recal that taste or appetite, which formerly bestowed charms on what now appears indifferent or disagreeable? What is the meaning therefore of those general preferences of the town or country life, of a life of action or one of pleasure, of retirement or society, when, besides the different inclinations of different men, every one's experience may convince him, that each of these kinds of life is agreeable in its turn, and that their variety or their judicious mixture chiefly contributes to the rendering all of them agreeable?

But shall this business be allowed to go altogether at adventures? And must a man consult only his humour and inclination, in order to determine his course of life, without employing his reason to inform him what road is preferable, and leads most surely to happiness? Is there no difference, then between one man's conduct and another?

I answer, there is a great difference. One man following his inclination, in choosing his course of life, may employ much surer means for succeeding than another, who is led by inclination into the same course of life, and pursues the same object. *Are riches the chief objects of your desires?* Acquire skill in your profession, be diligent in the exercise of it, enlarge the circle of your friends and acquaintances, avoid pleasure and expence, and never be generous, but with a view of gaining more than you could save by frugality. *Would you acquire the public esteem?* Guard equally against the extremes of arrogance and fawning. Let it appear that you set a value upon yourself, but without despising others. If you fall into either of the extremes, you either provoke men's pride by your insolence, or teach them to despise you by your timorous submission, and by the mean opinion which you seem to entertain of yourself.

These, you say, are the maxims of common prudence and discretion, what every parent inculcates on his child and what every man of sense pursues in the course of life which he has chosen.—What is it then you desire more? Do you come to a philosopher as to a *cunning man*, to learn something by magic or witchcraft, beyond what can be known by common prudence and discretion?—Yes, we come to a philosopher to be instructed, how we shall choose our ends, more than the means for attaining these ends. we want to know what desire we shall gratify, what passion we shall comply with, what appetite we shall indulge. As to the rest, we trust to common sense, and the general maxims of the world, for our instruction.

I am sorry, then, I have pretended to be a philosopher. for I find your questions very perplexing, and am in danger, if my answer be too rigid and severe, of passing for a pedant and scholastic, if it be too easy and free, of being taken for a preacher of vice and immorality. However, to satisfy you, I shall deliver my opinion upon the matter.

and shall only desire you to esteem it of as little consequence as I do myself. By that means you will neither think it worthy of your ridicule nor your anger.

If we can depend upon any principle, which we learn from philosophy, this, I think, may be considered as certain and undoubted, that there is nothing, in itself, valuable or despicable, desirable or hateful, beautiful or deformed; but that these attributes arise from the particular constitution and fabric of human sentiment and affection. What seems the most delicious food to one animal, appears loathsome to another: what affects the feeling of one with delight, produces uneasiness in another. This is confessedly the case with regard to all the bodily senses: but, if we examine the matter more accurately, we shall find that the same observation holds even where the mind concurs with the body, and mingles its sentiment with the exterior appetite.

Desire this passionate lover to give you a character of his mistress: he will tell you, that he is at a loss for words to describe her charms, and will ask you very seriously if ever you were acquainted with a goddess or an angel? If you answer that you never were: he will then say, that it is impossible for you to form a conception of such divine beauties as those which his charmer possesses; so complete a shape; such well-proportioned features; so engaging an air; such sweetness of disposition; such gaiety of humour. You can infer nothing, however, from all this discourse, but that the poor man is in love; and that the general appetite between the sexes, which nature has infused into all animals, is in him determined to a particular object by some qualities which give him pleasure. The same divine creature, not only to a different animal, but also to a different man, appears a mere mortal being, and is beheld with the utmost indifference.

Nature has given all animals a like prejudice in favour of their offspring. As soon as the helpless infant sees the light, though in every other eye it appears a despicable and a miserable creature, it is regarded by its fond parent with the utmost affection, and is preferred to every other object, however perfect and accomplished. The passion alone, arising from the original structure and formation of human nature, bestows a value on the most insignificant object.

We may push the same observation further, and may conclude that, even when the mind operates alone, and feeling the sentiment of blame or approbation, pronounces one object deformed and odious, another beautiful and amiable; I say that, even in this case, those qualities are not really in the objects, but belong entirely to the sentiment of that mind which blames or praises. I grant, that it will be more difficult to make this proposition evident, and, as it were, palpable, to negligent thinkers; because nature is more uniform in the sentiments of the mind than in most feelings of the body, and produces a nearer resemblance in the inward than in the outward part of human kind.

There is something approaching to principles in mental taste; and critics can reason and dispute more plausibly than cooks or perfumers. We may observe, however, that this uniformity among human kind, hinders not, but that there is a considerable diversity in the sentiments of beauty and worth, and that education, custom, prejudice caprice, and humour, frequently vary our taste of this kind. You will never convince a man, who is not accustomed to Italian music, and has not an ear to follow its intricacies, that a Scots tune is not preferable. You have not even any single argument, beyond your own taste, which you can employ in your behalf: and to your antagonist his particular taste will always appear a more convincing argument to the contrary. If you be wise, each of you will allow that the other may be in the right; and having many other instances of this diversity of taste, you will both confess, that beauty and worth are merely of a relative nature, and consist in an agreeable sentiment, produced by an object in a particular mind, according to the peculiar structure and constitution of that mind.

By this diversity of sentiment, observable in human kind, nature has, perhaps, intended to make us sensible of her authority, and let us see what surprising changes she could produce on the passions and desires of mankind, merely by the change of their inward fabric, without any alteration on the objects. The vulgar may even be convinced by this argument. But men, accustomed to thinking, may draw a more convincing, at least a more general argument, from the very nature of the subject.

In the operation of reasoning, the mind does nothing but run over its objects, as they are supposed to stand in reality, without adding any thing to them, or diminishing any thing from them. If I examine the Ptolomaic and Copernican systems, I endeavour only, by my inquiries, to know the real situation of the planets; that is, in other words, I endeavour to give them, in my conception, the same relations that they bear towards each other in the heavens. To this operation of the mind, therefore, there seems to be always a real, though often an unknown standard, in the nature of things; nor is truth or falsehood variable by the various apprehensions of mankind. Though all the human race should for ever conclude, that the sun moves, and the earth remains at rest, the sun stirs not an inch from his place for all these reasonings; and such conclusions are eternally false and erroneous.

But the case is not the same with the qualities of *beautiful and deformed, desirable and odious*, as with truth and falshood. In the former case, the mind is not content with merely surveying its objects, as they stand in themselves: it also feels a sentiment of delight or uneasiness, approbation or blame, consequent to that survey; and this sentiment determines it to affix the epithet *beautiful or deformed*,

desirable or odious Now, it is evident, that this sentiment must depend upon the particular fabric or structure of the mind, which enables such particular forms to operate in such a particular manner, and produces a sympathy or conformity between the mind and its objects Vary the structure of the mind or inward organs, the sentiment no longer follows, though the form remains the same The sentiment being different from the object, and arising from its operation upon the organs of the mind, an alteration upon the latter must vary the effect, nor can the same object, presented to a mind totally different, produce the same sentiment

This conclusion every one is apt to draw of himself, without much philosophy, where the sentiment is evidently distinguishable from the object Who is not sensible, that power, and glory, and vengeance, are not desirable of themselves, but derive all their value from the structure of human passions, which begets a desire towards such particular pursuits? But with regard to beauty, either natural or moral the case is commonly supposed to be different The agreeable quality is thought to lie in the object, not in the sentiment, and that merely because the sentiment is not so turbulent and violent as to distinguish itself, in an evident manner from the perception of the object

But a little reflection suffices to distinguish them A man may know exactly all the circles and ellipses of the Copernican system and all the irregular spirals of the Ptolemaic without perceiving that the former is more beautiful than the latter Euclid has fully explained every quality of the circle, but has not in any proposition, said a word of its beauty The reason is evident Beauty is not a quality of the circle It lies not in any part of the line, *whose* parts are all equally distant from a common centre It is only the effect, which that figure produces upon a mind whose particular fabric or structure renders it susceptible of such sentiments In vain would you look for it in the circle, or seek it, either by your senses, or by mathematical reasonings, in all the properties of that figure

The mathematician, who took no other pleasure in reading Virgil, but that of examining Eneas' voyage by the map, might perfectly understand the meaning of every Latin word, employed by that divine author, and, consequently, might have a distinct idea of the whole narration. He would even have a more distinct idea of it, than they could attain who had not studied so exactly the geography of the poem He knew, therefore, every thing in the poem but he was ignorant of its beauty, because the beauty, properly speaking, lies not in the poem, but in the sentiment or taste of the reader And where a man has no such delicacy of temper as to make him feel this sentiment, he must be ignorant of the beauty, though possessed of the science and understanding of an angel *

* Were I not afraid of appearing too philosophical, I should remind my reader of that

The inference upon the whole is, that it is not from the value or worth of the object which any person pursues, that we can determine his enjoyment, but merely from the passion with which he pursues it, and the success which he meets with in his pursuit. Objects have absolutely no worth or value in themselves. They derive their worth merely from the passion. If that be strong, and steady, and successful, the person is happy. It cannot reasonably be doubted, but a little miss, dressed in a new gown for a dancing-school ball, receives as complete enjoyment as the greatest orator, who triumphs in the splendour of his eloquence, while he governs the passions and resolutions of a numerous assembly.

All the difference, therefore, between one man and another, with regard to life, consists either in the *passion*, or in the *enjoyment*: and these differences are sufficient to produce the wide extremes of happiness and misery.

To be happy, the *passion* must neither be too violent, nor too remiss. In the first case, the mind is in a perpetual hurry and tumult; in the second, it sinks into a disagreeable indolence and lethargy.

To be happy, the passion must be benign and social; not rough or fierce. The affections of the latter kind are not near so agreeable to the feeling, as those of the former. Who will compare rancour and animosity, envy and revenge, to friendship, benignity, clemency, and gratitude?

To be happy, the passion must be cheerful and gay, not gloomy and melancholy. A propensity to hope and joy is real riches: one to fear and sorrow, real poverty.

Some passions or inclinations, in the *enjoyment* of their object, are not so steady or constant as others, nor convey such durable pleasure and satisfaction.

Though the tempers of men be very different, yet we may safely pronounce in general, that a life of pleasure cannot support itself so long as one of business, but is much more subject to satiety and disgust. The amusements which are the most durable, have all a mixture of application and attention in them; such as gaming and hunting. And in general, business and action fill up all the great vacancies in human life.

But where the temper is the best disposed for any *enjoyment*, the object is often wanting: and in this respect, the passions, which

famous doctrine, supposed to be fully proved in modern times, 'That tastes and colours, and 'all other sensible qualities lie not in the bodies, but merely in the senses.' The case is the same with beauty and deformity, virtue and vice. This doctrine, however, takes off no more from the reality of the latter qualities, than from that of the former; nor need it give any umbrage either to critics or moralists. Though colours were allowed to lie only in the eye, would dyers or painters ever be less regarded or esteemed? There is a sufficient uniformity in the senses and feelings of mankind, to make all these qualities the objects of art and reasoning, and to have the greatest influence on life and manners. And as it is certain, that the discovery above mentioned in natural philosophy, makes no alteration on action and conduct; why should a like discovery in moral philosophy make any alteration?

pursue external objects, contribute not so much to happiness, as those which rest in ourselves, since we are neither so certain of attaining such objects, nor so secure in possessing them A passion for learning is preferable, with regard to happiness, to one for riches

Some men are possessed of great strength of mind, and even when they pursue *external* objects, are not much affected by a disappointment, but renew their application and industry with the greatest cheerfulness Nothing contributes more to our happiness than such a turn of mind

According to this short and imperfect sketch of human life, the happiest disposition of mind is the *virtuous*, or, in other words, that which leads to action and employment, renders us sensible to the social passions, steels the heart against the assaults of fortune, reduces the affections to a just moderation, makes our own thoughts an entertainment to us, and inclines us rather to the pleasures of society and conversation, than to those of the senses This, in the meantime, must be obvious to the most careless reasoner, that all dispositions of mind are not alike favourable to happiness, and that one passion or humour may be extremely desirable, while another is equally disagreeable And, indeed, all the difference between the conditions of life depends upon the mind, nor is there any one situation of affairs, in itself, preferable to another Good and ill, both natural and moral, are entirely relative to human sentiment and affection No man would ever be unhappy, could he alter his feelings Proteus-like, he would elude all attacks, by his continual alterations of shape and form

But of this resource nature has, in a great measure, deprived us. The fabric and constitution of our mind no more depends on our choice, than that of our body The generality of men have not even the smallest notion, that any alteration in this respect can ever be desirable As a stream necessarily follows the several inclinations of the ground on which it runs, so are the ignorant and thoughtless part of mankind actuated by their natural propensities Such are effectually excluded from all pretentions to philosophy, and *the medicine of the mind*, so much boasted But even upon the wise and thoughtful, nature has a prodigious influence, nor is it always in a man's power, by the utmost art and industry, to correct his temper and attain that virtuous character, to which he aspires The empire of philosophy extends over a few, and with regard to these too, her authority is very weak and limited Men may well be sensible of the value of virtue, and may desire to attain it, but it is not always certain, that they will be successful in their wishes.

Whoever considers, without prejudice, the course of human actions, will find, that mankind are almost entirely guided by constitution and temper, and that general maxims have little influence, but so far as they affect our taste or sentiment. If a man have a lively sense of

honour and virtue, with moderate passions, his conduct will always be comformable to the rules of morality; or if he depart from them, his return will be easy and expeditious. On the other hand, where one is born of so perverse a frame of mind, of so callous and insensible a disposition, as to have no relish for virtue and humanity, no sympathy with his fellow-creatures, no desire of esteem or applause; such a one must be allowed entirely to be incurable, nor is there any remedy in philosophy. He reaps no satisfaction but from low and sensual objects, or from the indulgence of malignant passions: he feels no remorse to control his vicious inclinations: he has not even that sense or taste, which is requisite to make him desire a better character. For my part, I know not how I should address myself to such a one, or by what arguments I should endeavour to reform him. Should I tell him of the inward satisfaction which results from laudable and humane actions, the delicate pleasure of disinterested love and friendship, the lasting enjoyments of a good name and an established character, he might still reply, that these were, perhaps, pleasures to such as were susceptible of them; but that, for his part, he finds himself of a quite different turn and disposition. I must repeat it; my philosophy affords no remedy in such a case, nor could I do any thing but lament this person's unhappy condition. But then I ask, If any other philosophy can afford a remedy; or if it be possible by any system, to render all mankind virtuous, however perverse may be their natural frame of mind? Experience will soon convince us of the contrary; and I will venture to affirm that, perhaps, the chief benefit, which results from philosophy, arises in an indirect manner, and proceeds more from its secret, insensible influence, than from its immediate application.

It is certain, that a serious attention to the sciences and liberal arts softens and humanizes the temper, and cherishes those fine emotions, in which true virtue and honour consists. It rarely, very rarely happens, that a man of taste and learning is not, at least, an honest man, whatever frailties may attend him. The bent of his mind to speculative studies must mortify in him the passions of interest and ambition, and must, at the same time, give him a greater sensibility of all the decencies and duties of life. He feels more fully a moral distinction in characters and manners; nor is his sense of this kind diminished, but, on the contrary, it is increased by speculation.

Besides such insensible changes upon the temper and disposition, it is highly probable, that others may be produced by study and application. The prodigious effects of education may convince us, that the mind is not altogether stubborn and inflexible, but will admit of many alterations from its original make and structure. Let a man propose to himself the model of a character which he approves: let him be well acquainted with those particulars in which his own character deviates from this model: let him keep a constant watch over himself, and

bend his mind, by a continual effort, from the vices, towards the virtues, and I doubt not but, in time, he will find, in his temper, an alteration for the better.

Habit is another powerful means of reforming the mind, and implanting in it good dispositions and inclinations A man, who continues in a course of sobriety and temperance, will hate riot and disorder if he engage in business or study, indolence will seem a punishment to him if he constrain himself to practise beneficence and affability, he will soon abhor all instances of pride and violence Where one is thoroughly convinced that the virtuous course of life is preferable, if he have but resolution enough, for some time, to impose a violence on himself, his reformation needs not to be despaired of The misfortune is, that this conviction and this resolution never can have place, unless a man be, before hand, tolerably virtuous

Here then is the chief triumph of art and philosophy it insensibly refines the temper, and it points out to us those dispositions which we should endeavour to attain, by a constant *bent* of mind, and by repeated *habit* Beyond this I cannot acknowledge it to have great influence, and I must entertain doubts concerning all those exhortations and consolations, which are in vogue among speculative reasoners

We have already observed, that no objects are, in themselves, desirable or odious, valuable or despicable, but that objects acquire these qualities from the particular character and constitution of the mind which surveys them To diminish, therefore, or augment any person's value for an object, to excite or moderate his passions, there are no direct arguments or reasons, which can be employed with any force or influence The catching of flies, like Domitian, if it give more pleasure, is preferable to the hunting of wild beasts, like William Rufus, or the conquering of kingdoms, like Alexander

But though the value of every object can be determined only by the sentiment or passion of every individual, we may observe, that the passion, in pronouncing its verdict, considers not the object simply as it is in itself, but surveys it with all the circumstances which attend it A man transported with joy, on account of his possessing a diamond, confines not his view to the glittering stone before him he also considers its rarity, and hence chiefly arises his pleasure and exultation Here therefore a philosopher may step in, and suggest particular views, and considerations, and circumstances, which otherwise would have escaped us, and by that means, he may either moderate or excite any particular passion

It may seem unreasonable absolutely to deny the authority of philosophy in this respect but it must be confessed, that there lies this strong presumption against it, that, if these views be natural and obvious, they would have occurred of themselves, without the assistance of philosophy, if they be not natural, they never can have any

influence on the affections. *These* are of a very delicate nature, and cannot be forced or constrained by the utmost art or industry A consideration which we seek for on purpose, which we enter into with difficulty, which we cannot attain without care and attention, will never produce those genuine and durable movements of passion, which are the result of nature, and the constitution of the mind A man may as well pretend to cure himself of love, by viewing his mistress through the *artificial* medium of a microscope or prospect, and beholding there the coarseness of her skin, and monstrous disproportion of her features, as hope to excite or moderate any passion by the *artificial* arguments of a Seneca or an Epictetus The remembrance of the natural aspect and situation of the object, will, in both cases, still recur upon him The reflections of philosophy are too subtle and distant to take place in common life, or to eradicate any affection The air is too fine to breathe in, where it is above the winds and the clouds of the atmosphere

Another defect of those refined reflections, which philosophy suggests to us, is, that commonly they cannot diminish or extinguish our vicious passions, without diminishing or extinguishing such as are virtuous, and rendering the mind totally indifferent and inactive They are, for the most part, general, and are applicable to all our affections In vain do we hope to direct their influence only to one side If by incessant study and meditation we have rendered them intimate and present to us, they will operate throughout, and spread an universal insensibility over the mind When we destroy the nerves, we extinguish the sense of pleasure, together with that of pain, in the human body

It will be easy, by one glance of the eye, to find one or other of these defects in most of those philosophical reflections, so much celebrated both in ancient and modern times *Let not the injuries or violence of men*, say the philosophers [*De Ira cohibenda* PLUT] *ever discompose you by anger or hatred Would you be angry at the ape for its malice, or the tiger for its ferocity?* This reflection leads us into a bad opinion of human nature, and must extinguish the social affections. Its tends also to prevent all remorse for a man s own crimes , when he considers, that vice is as natural to mankind, as the particular instincts are to brute creatures

All ills arise from the order of the universe, which is absolutely perfect Would you wish to disturb so divine an order for the sake of your own particular interest? What if the ills I suffer arise from malice or oppression? *But the vices and imperfections of men are also comprehended in the order of the universe*

If plagues and earthquakes break not heav'n's design,
Why then a BORGIA *or a* CATILINE?

Let this be allowed, and my own vices will also be a part of the same order

To one who said, that none were happy, who were not above opinion, a Spartan replied, *Then none are happy but knaves and robbers* [PLUT *Lacon Apophtheg*]

Man is born to be miserable, and is he surprised at any particular misfortune? And can he give way to sorrow and lamentation upon account of any disaster? Yes he very reasonably laments, that he should be born to be miserable Your consolation presents a hundred ills for one, of which you pretend to ease him

You should always have before your eyes death, disease, poverty, blindness, exile, calumny, and infamy, as ills which are incident to human nature If any of these ills fall to your lot, you will bear it the better, when you have reckoned upon it I answer, if we confine ourselves to a general and distant reflection on the ills of human life, *that* can have no effect to prepare us for them If by close and intense meditation we render them present and intimate to us, *that* is the true secret for poisoning all our pleasures, and rendering us perpetually miserable

Your sorrow is fruitless, and will not change the course of destiny Very true and for that very reason I am sorry

Cicero's consolation for deafness is somewhat curious *How many languages are there, says he, which you do not understand? The Punic, Spanish, Gallic, Egyptian, &c With regard to all these, you are as if you were deaf, yet you are indifferent about the matter Is it then so great a misfortune to be deaf to one language more?* [Tusc Quest lib v]

I like better the repartee of Antipater the Cyrenaic, when some women were condoling with him for his blindness *What!* says he, *Do you think there are no pleasures in the dark?*

Nothing can be more destructive, says Fontenelle, *to ambition, and the passion for conquest, than the true system of astronomy What a poor thing is even the whole globe in comparison with the infinite extent of Nature?* This consideration is evidently too distant ever to have any effect Or, if it had any, would it not destroy patriotism as well as ambition? The same gallant author adds, with some reason, that the bright eyes of the ladies are the only objects, which lose nothing of their lustre or value from the most extensive views of astronomy, but stand proof against every system. Would philosophers advise us to limit our affections to them?

Exile, says Plutarch to a friend in banishment, *is no evil mathematicians tell us, that the whole earth is but a point, compared to the heavens. To change one's country, then, is little more than to remove from one street to another. Man is not a plant, rooted in a certain spot of earth: all soils and all climates are alike suited*

to him [*De exilio*.] These topics are admirable, could they fall only into the hands of banished persons. But what if they come also to the knowledge of those who are employed in public affairs, and destroy all their attachment to their native country? Or will they operate like the quack's medicine, which is equally good for a diabetes and for a dropsy?

It is certain, were a superior being thrust into a human body, that the whole of life would to him appear so mean, contemptible, and puerile, that he never could be induced to take part in any thing, and would scarcely give attention to what passes around him. To engage him to such a condescension as to play even the part of a Philip with zeal and alacrity, would be much more difficult, than to constrain the same Philip, after having been a king and a conqueror during fifty years, to mend old shoes with proper care and attention; the occupation which Lucian assigns him in the infernal regions. Now all the same topics of disdain towards human affairs, which could operate on this supposed being, occur also to a philosopher; but being, in some measure, disproportioned to human capacity, and not being fortified by the experience of any thing better, they make not a full impression on him. He sees, but he feels not sufficiently their truth; and is always a sublime philosopher, when he needs not; that is, as long as nothing disturbs him, or rouses his affections. While others play, he wonders at their keenness and ardour; but he no sooner puts in his own stake, than he is commonly transported with the same passions, that he had so much condemned, while he remained a simple spectator.

There are two considerations, chiefly, to be met with in books of philosophy, from which any important effect is to be expected, and that because these considerations are drawn from common life, and occur upon the most superficial view of human affairs. When we reflect on the shortness and uncertainty of life, how despicable seem all our pursuits of happiness? And even, if we would extend our concern beyond our own life, how frivolous appear our most enlarged and most generous projects; when we consider the incessant changes and revolutions of human affairs, by which laws and learning, books and government, are hurried away by time, as by a rapid stream, and are lost in the immense ocean of matter? Such a reflection certainly tends to mortify all our passions: but does it not thereby counterwork the artifice of nature, who has happily deceived us into an opinion that human life is of some importance? And may not such a reflection be employed with success by voluptuous reasoners, in order to lead us, from the paths of action and virtue, into the flowery fields of indolence and of pleasure?

We are informed by Thucydides, that, during the famous plague of Athens, when death seemed present to every one, a dissolute mirth

and gaiety prevailed among the people, who exhorted one another to make the most of life as long as it endured. The same observation is made by Boccace, with regard to the plague of Florence. A like principle makes soldiers, during war, be more addicted to riot and expence, than any other race of men. Present pleasure is always of importance; and whatever diminishes the importance of all other objects must bestow on it an additional influence and value.

The *second* philosophical consideration, which may often have an influence on the affections, is derived from a comparison of our own condition with the condition of others. This comparison we are continually making even in common life; but the misfortune is, that we are rather apt to compare our situation with that of our superiors, than with that of our inferiors. A philosopher corrects this natural infirmity, by turning his view to the other side, in order to render himself easy in the situation to which fortune has confined him. There are few people who are not susceptible of some consolation from this reflection, though, to a very good natured man, the view of human miseries should rather produce sorrow than comfort, and add, to his lamentations for his own misfortunes, a deep compassion for those of others. Such is the imperfection, even of the best of these philosophical topics of consolation.*

* The Sceptic, perhaps, carries the matter too far, when he limits all philosophical topics and reflections to these two. There seem to be others, whose truth is undeniable, and whose natural tendency is to tranquillize and soften all the passions. Philosophy greedily seizes these, studies them, weighs them, commits them to the memory, and familiarises them to the mind: and their influence on tempers which are thoughtful, gentle, and moderate, may be considerable. But what is their influence, you will say, if the temper be antecedently disposed after the same manner as that to which they pretend to form it? They may, at least, fortify that temper, and furnish it with views, by which it may entertain and nourish itself. Here are a few examples of such philosophical reflections.

1. Is it not certain, that every condition has concealed ills? Then why envy any body? 2. Every one has known ills; and there is a compensation throughout. Why not be contented with the present? 3. Custom deadens the sense both of the good and the ill, and levels every thing. 4. Health and humour all. The rest of little consequence, except these be affected. 5. How many other good things have I? Then why be vexed for one ill? 6. How many are happy in the condition of which I complain? How many envy me? 7. Every good must be paid for: fortune by labour, favour by flattery. Would I keep the price, yet have the commodity? 8. Expect not too great happiness in life. Human nature admits it not. 9. Propose not a happiness too complicated. But does that depend on me? Yes: the first choice does. Life is like a game: one may chuse the game: and passion, by degrees, seizes the proper object. 10. Anticipate by your hopes and fancy future consolation, which time infallibly brings to every affliction. 11. I desire to be rich. Why? That I may possess many fine objects; houses, gardens, equipage, &c. How many fine objects does nature offer to every one without expence? If enjoyed, sufficient. If not: see the effect of custom or of temper, which would soon take off the relish of the riches. 12. I desire fame. Let this occur: if I act well, I shall have the esteem of all my acquaintance. And what is all the rest to me?

These reflections are so obvious, that it is a wonder they occur not to every man: so convincing, that it is a wonder they persuade not every man. But perhaps they do not occur to and persuade most men, when they consider human life by a general and calm survey: but where any real, affecting incident happens; when passion is awakened, fancy agitated, example draws, and counsel urges; the philosopher is lost in the man, and he seeks in vain for that persuasion which before seemed so firm and unshaken. What remedy for this inconvenience? Assist yourself by a frequent perusal of the entertaining moralists: have recourse to the learning of Plutarch, the imagination of Lucian, the eloquence of Cicero, the wit of Seneca, the gaiety of Montaigne, the sublimity of Shaftesbury. Moral precepts, so couched, strike deep, and fortify the mind against the illusions of passion. But trust not altogether to external aid: by habit and study acquire that philosophical temper which both gives force to reflection, and

I shall conclude this subject with observing, that, though virtue be undoubtedly the best choice, when it is attainable; yet such is the disorder and confusion of human affairs, that no perfect or regular distribution of happiness and misery is ever, in this life, to be expected. Not only the goods of fortune, and the endowments of the body (both of which are important), not only these advantages, I say, are unequally divided between the virtuous and vicious, but even the mind itself partakes, in some degree, of this disorder, and the most worthy character, by the very constitution of the passions, enjoys not always the highest felicity.

It is observable, that though every bodily pain proceeds from some disorder in the part or organ, yet the pain is not always proportioned to the disorder, but is greater or less, according to the greater or less sensibility of the part, upon which the noxious humours exert their influence. A *tooth-ache* produces more violent convulsions of pain than a *phthisis* or a *dropsy*. In like manner, with regard to the economy of the mind, we may observe, that all vice is indeed pernicious, yet the disturbance or pain is not measured out by nature with exact proportion to the degrees of vice, nor is the man of highest virtue, even abstracting from external accidents, always the most happy. A gloomy and melancholy disposition is certainly, *to our sentiments*, a vice or imperfection, but as it may be accompanied with great sense of honour and great integrity, it may be found in very worthy characters, though it is sufficient alone to imbitter life, and render the person affected with it completely miserable. On the other hand, a selfish villain may possess a spring and alacrity of temper, a certain *gaiety of heart*, which is indeed a good quality, but which is rewarded much beyond its merit, and when attended with good fortune, will compensate for the uneasiness and remorse arising from the other vices.

I shall add, as an observation to the same purpose, that, if a man be liable to a vice or imperfection it may often happen, that a good quality, which he possesses along with it, will render him more miserable, than if he were completely vicious. A person of such imbecility of temper, as to be easily broken by affliction, is more unhappy for being endowed with a generous and friendly disposition, which gives him a lively concern for others, and exposes him the more to fortune and accidents. A sense of shame, in an imperfect character, is certainly a virtue, but produces great uneasiness and remorse, from which the abandoned villain is entirely free. A very amorous complexion, with a heart incapable of friendship, is happier than the same excess in love, with a generosity of temper, which transports a man beyond himself, and renders him a total slave to the object of his passion.

by rendering a great part of your happiness independent, takes off the edge from all disorderly passions, and tranquilizes the mind. Despise not these helps but confide not too much in them neither, unless nature has been favourable in the temper, with which she has endowed you.

In a word, human life is more governed by fortune than by reason is to be regarded more as a dull pastime than a serious occupation, and is more influenced by particular humour, than by general principles Shall we engage ourselves in it with passion and anxiety? It is not worthy of so much concern Shall we be indifferent about what hap pens? We lose all the pleasure of the game by our phlegm and carelessness. While we are reasoning concerning life, life is gone, and death, though *perhaps* they receive him differently, yet awaits alike the fool and the philosopher To reduce life to exact rule and method is commonly a painful, oft a fruitless occupation and is it not also a proof, that we overvalue the prize for which we contend? Even to reason so carefully concerning it, and to fix with accuracy its just idea, would be overvaluing it, were it not that, to some tempers, this occupation is one of the most amusing in which life could possibly be employed.

XVIII —OF POLYGAMY AND DIVORCES

As marriage is an engagement entered into by mutual consent, and has for its end the propagation of the species, it is evident, that it must be susceptible of all the variety of conditions which consent establishes, provided they be not contrary to this end.

A man, in conjoining himself to a woman, is bound to her according to the terms of his engagement in begetting children, he is bound, by all the ties of nature and humanity, to provide for their subsistence and education When he has performed these two parts of duty, no one can reproach him with injustice or injury And as the terms of his engagement, as well as the methods of subsisting his offspring, may be various, it is mere superstition to imagine, that marriage can be entirely uniform, and will admit only of one mode or form. Did not human laws restrain the natural liberty of men, every particular marriage would be as different as contracts or bargains of any other kind or species

As circumstances vary, and the laws propose different advantages, we find, that, in different times and places, they impose different conditions on this important contract. In Tonquin, it is usual for sailors, when the ship comes into harbour, to marry for the season, and, notwithstanding this precarious engagement, they are assured, it is said, of the strictest fidelity to their bed, as well as in the whole management of their affairs, from those temporary spouses

I cannot, at present, recollect my authorities, but I have some

where read, that the republic of Athens, having lost many of its citizens by war and pestilence, allowed every man to marry two wives, in order the sooner to repair the waste which had been made by these calamities. The poet Euripides happened to be coupled to two noisy Vixens, who so plagued him with their jealousies and quarrels, that he became ever after a professed *woman-hater*, and is the only theatrical writer, perhaps the only poet, that ever entertained an aversion to the sex.

In that agreeable romance, called the *History of the Sevarambians*, where a great many men and a few women are supposed to be shipwrecked on a desert coast, the captain of the troop, in order to obviate those endless quarrels which arose, regulates their marriages after the following manner: he takes a handsome female to himself alone; assigns one to every couple of inferior officers, and to five of the lowest rank he gave one wife in common.

The ancient Britons had a singular kind of marriage, to be met with among no other people. Any number of them, as ten or a dozen, joined in a society together, which was perhaps requisite for mutual defence in those barbarous times. In order to link this society the closer, they took an equal number of wives in common; and whatever children were born, were reputed to belong to all of them, and were accordingly provided for by the whole community.

Among the inferior creatures, nature herself, being the supreme legislator, prescribes all the laws which regulate their marriages, and varies those laws according to the different circumstances of the creature. Where she furnishes, with ease, food and defence to the newborn animal, the present embrace terminates the marriage; and the care of the offspring is committed entirely to the female. Where the food is of more difficult purchase, the marriage continues for one season, till the common progeny can provide for itself; and then the union immediately dissolves, and leaves each of the parties free to enter into a new engagement at the ensuing season. But nature, having endowed man with reason, has not so exactly regulated every article of his marriage contract, but has left him to adjust them, by his own prudence, according to his particular circumstances and situation. Municipal laws are a supply to the wisdom of each individual; and, at the same time, by restraining the natural liberty of men, make private interest submit to the interest of the public. All regulations, therefore, on this head, are equally lawful, and equally conformable to the principles of nature; though they are not all equally convenient, or equally useful to society. The laws may allow of polygamy, as among the *Eastern* nations; or of voluntary divorces, as among the Greeks and Romans; or they may confine one man to one woman, during the whole course of their lives, as among the modern Europeans. It may not be disagreeable to consider the

advantages and disadvantages which result from each of these institutions.

The advocates for polygamy may recommend it as the only effectual remedy for the disorders of love, and the only expedient for freeing men from that slavery to the females, which the natural violence of our passions has imposed upon us. By this means alone can we regain our right of sovereignty; and, sating our appetite, re-establish the authority of reason in our minds, and, of consequence, our own authority in our families. Man, like a weak sovereign, being unable to support himself against the wiles and intrigues of his subjects, must play one faction against another, and become absolute by the mutual jealousy of the females. *To divide and to govern* is an universal maxim; and by neglecting it, the Europeans undergo a more grievous and a more ignominious slavery than the Turks or Persians, who are subjected indeed to a sovereign, that lies at a distance from them, but in their domestic affairs they rule with an uncontrolable sway.

On the other hand, it may be urged with better reason, that this sovereignty of the male is a real usurpation, and destroys that nearness of rank, not to say equality, which nature has established between the sexes. We are, by nature, their lovers, their friends, their patrons: would we willingly exchange such endearing appellations for the barbarous title of master and tyrant?

In what capacity shall we gain by this inhuman proceeding? As lovers, or as husbands? The *lover* is totally annihilated; and courtship, the most agreeable scene in life, can no longer have place where women have not the free disposal of themselves, but are bought and sold, like the meanest animal. The *husband* is as little a gainer, having found the admirable secret of extinguishing every part of love, except its jealousy. No rose without its thorn; but he must be a foolish wretch indeed, that throws away the rose and preserves only the thorn.

But the Asiatic manners are as destructive to friendship as to love. Jealousy excludes men from all intimacies and familiarities with each other. No one dares bring his friend to his house or table, lest he bring a lover to his numerous wives. Hence, all over the east, each family is as much separate from another as if they were so many distinct kingdoms. No wonder then that Solomon, living like an eastern prince, with his seven hundred wives, and three hundred concubines, without one friend, could write so pathetically concerning the vanity of the world. Had he tried the secret of one wife or mistress, a few friends, and a great many companions, he might have found life somewhat more agreeable. Destroy love and friendship, what remains in the world worth accepting?

The bad education of children, especially children of condition, is

another unavoidable consequence of these eastern institutions. Those who pass the early part of life among slaves, are only qualified to be, themselves, slaves and tyrants, and in every future intercourse, either with their inferiors or superiors, are to forget the natural equality of mankind. What attention, too, can it be supposed a parent, whose seraglio affords him fifty sons, will give to instilling principles of morality or science into a progeny, with whom he himself is scarcely acquainted, and whom he loves with so divided an affection? Barbarism, therefore, appears, from reason as well as experience, to be the inseparable attendant of polygamy.

To render polygamy more odious, I need not recount the frightful effects of jealousy, and the constraint in which it holds the fair-sex all over the east. In those countries men are not allowed to have any commerce with the females, not even physicians, when sickness may be supposed to have extinguished all wanton passions in the bosoms of the fair, and, at the same time, has rendered them unfit objects of desire. Tournefort tells us, that when he was brought into the *Grand Signior's* seraglio as a physician, he was not a little surprised, in looking along a gallery, to see a great number of naked arms standing out from the sides of the room. He could not imagine what this could mean, till he was told that those arms belonged to bodies, which he must cure, without knowing any more about them than what he could learn from the arms. He was not allowed to ask a question of the patient, or even of her attendants, lest he might find it necessary to inquire concerning circumstances which the delicacy of the Seraglio allows not to be revealed. Hence physicians in the east pretend to know all diseases from the pulse, as our quacks in Europe undertake to cure a person merely from seeing his water. I suppose, had Monsieur Tournefort, been of this latter kind, he would not, in Constantinople, have been allowed by the jealous Turks, to be furnished with materials requisite for exercising his art.

In another country, where polygamy is also allowed, they render their wives cripples, and make their feet of no use to them, in order to confine them to their own houses. But it will, perhaps, appear strange, that, in a European country, jealousy can yet be carried to such a height, that it is indecent so much as to suppose that a woman of rank can have feet or legs. Witness the following story, which we have from very good authority.* When the mother of the late king of Spain was on her road towards Madrid, she passed through a little town in Spain famous for its manufactory of gloves and stockings. The magistrates of the place thought they could not better express their joy for the reception of their new queen, than by presenting her with a sample of those commodities, for which alone their town was remarkable. The *major domo*, who conducted the

* *Memoires de la cour d'Espagne, par Madame d'Aunoy.*

princess, received the gloves very graciously, but, when the stockings were presented, he flung them away with great indignation, and severely reprimanded the magistrates for this egregious piece of indecency *Know*, says he, *that a queen of Spain hath no legs* The young queen, who at that time understood the language but imperfectly, and had often been frightened with stories of Spanish jealousy, imagined that they were to cut off her legs Upon which she fell a crying, and begged tham to conduct her back to Germany, for that she never could endure the operation, and it was with some difficulty they could appease her Philip IV is said never in his life to have laughed heartily but at the recital of this story

Having rejected polygamy, and matched one man with one woman, let us now consider what duration we shall assign to their union, and whether we shall admit of those voluntary divorces which were customary among the Greeks and Romans Those who would defend this practice, may employ the following reasons

How often does disgust and aversion arise, after marriage, from the most trivial accidents, or from an incompatibility of humour, where time, instead of curing the wounds, proceeding from mutual injuries, festers them every day the more, by new quarrels and reproaches? Let us separate hearts which were not made to associate together Each of them may, perhaps, find another for which it is better fitted At least, nothing can be more cruel than to preserve, by violence, an union, which, at first was made by mutual love, and is now, in effect, dissolved by mutual hatred

But the liberty of divorces is not only a cure to hatred and domestic quarrels it is also an admirable preservation against them, and the only secret for keeping alive that love which first united the married couple The heart of man delights in liberty the very image of constraint is grievous to it when you would confine it by violence, to what would otherwise have been it's choice, the inclination immediately changes, and desire is turned into aversion If the public interest will not allow us to enjoy in polygamy that *variety* which is so agreeable in love, at least, deprive us not of that liberty which is so essentially requisite In vain you tell me, that I had my choice of the person with whom I would conjoin myself I had my choice, it is true, of my prison, but this is but a small comfort, since it must still be to me a prison.

Such are the arguments which may be urged in favour of divorces: but there seems to be these three unanswerable objections against them. I What must become of the children upon the separation of the parents? Must they be committed to the care of a stepmother, and, instead of the fond attention and concern of a parent, feel all the indifference or hatred of a stranger, or an enemy? These inconveniences are sufficiently felt, where nature has made the divorce by

the doom inevitable to all mortals and shall we seek to multiply those inconveniencies by multiplying divorces, and putting it in the power of parents, upon every caprice, to render their posterity miserable?

II.—If it be true, on the one hand, that the heart of man naturally delights in liberty, and hates every thing to which it is confined; it is also true, on the other, that the heart of man naturally submits to necessity, and soon loses an inclination, when there appears an absolute impossibility of gratifying it. These principles of human nature, you'll say, are contradictory but what is man but a heap of contradictions! Though it is remarkable, that where principles are, after this manner, contrary in their operation they do not always destroy each other; but the one or the other may predominate on any particular occasion, according as circumstances are more or less favourable to it. For instance, love is a restless and impatient passion, full of caprices and variations arising in a moment from a feature, from an air, from nothing, and suddenly extinguishing after the same manner. Such a passion requires liberty above all things; and therefore Eloisa had reason, when, in order to preserve this passion, she refused to marry her beloved Abelard.

How oft, when prest to marriage, have I said,
Curse on all laws but those which love has made
Love, free as air, at sight of human ties,
Spreads his light wings, and in a moment flies

But *friendship* is a calm and sedate affection, conducted by reason and cemented by habit; springing from long acquaintance and mutual obligations; without jealousies or fears, and without those feverish fits of heat and cold, which cause such an agreeable torment in the amorous passion. So sober an affection, therefore, as friendship, rather thrives under constraint, and never rises to such a height, as when any strong interest or necessity binds two persons together, and gives them some common object of pursuit. We need not, therefore, be afraid of drawing the marriage-knot, which chiefly subsists by friendship, the closest possible. The amity between the persons, where it is solid and sincere, will rather gain by it and where it is wavering and uncertain, this is the best expedient for fixing it. How many frivolous quarrels and disguts are there, which people of common prudence endeavour to forget, when they lie under a necessity of passing their lives together; but which would soon be inflamed into the most deadly hatred, were they pursued to the utmost, under the prospect of an easy separation?

III.—We must consider, that nothing is more dangerous than to unite two persons so closely in all their interests and concerns, as man and wife, without rendering the union entire and total. The least possibility of a separate interest must be the source of endless quarrels and suspicions. The wife, not secure of her establishment, will still

be driving some separate end or project, and the husband's selfishness, being accompanied with more power, may be still more dangerous.

Should these reasons against voluntary divorces be deemed insufficient, I hope nobody will pretend to refuse the testimony of experience At the time when divorces were most frequent among the Romans, marriages were most rare, and Augustus was obliged, by penal laws, to force men of fashion into the married state a circumstance which is scarcely to be found in any other age or nation The more ancient laws of Rome, which prohibited divorces, are extremely praised by Dionysius Halycarnassæus [Lib ii] Wonderful was the harmony, says the historian, which this inseparable union of interests produced between married persons, while each of them considered the inevitable necessity by which they were linked together, and abandoned all prospect of any other choice or establishment

The exclusion of polygamy and divorces sufficiently recommends our present European practice with regard to marriage.

XIX.—OF SIMPLICITY AND REFINEMENT IN WRITING

FINE writing according to Addison, consists of sentiments, which are natural, without being obvious There cannot be a juster and more concise definition of fine writing

Sentiments which are merely natural, affect not the mind with any pleasure, and seem not worthy of our attention The pleasantries of a waterman, the observations of a peasant, the ribaldry of a porter or hackney coachman, all of these are natural and disagreeable What an insipid comedy should we make of the chit-chat of the tea-table, copied faithfully and at full length? Nothing can please persons of taste but nature drawn with all her graces and ornaments, *la belle nature*, or if we copy low life, the strokes must be strong and remarkable, and must convey a lively image to the mind The absurd *naiveté of Sanco Pancho* is represented in such inimitable colours by Cervantes, that it entertains as much as the picture of the most magnanimous hero or the softest lover

The case is the same with orators, philosophers, critics, or any author who speaks in his own person, without introducing other speakers or actors If his language be not elegant, his observations uncommon, his sense strong and masculine, he will in vain boast his nature and simplicity. He may be correct; but he never will be agreeable. It is the unhappiness of such authors, that they are never

blamed or censured The good fortune of a book, and that of a man, are not the same. The secret deceiving path of life, which Horace talks of, *fallentis semita vitæ*, may be the happiest lot of the one, but it is the greatest misfortune which the other can possibly fall into

On the other hand, productions which are merely surprising, without being natural, can never give any lasting entertainment to the mind To draw chimeras, is not, properly speaking, to copy or imitate The justness of representation is lost, and the mind is displeased to find a picture which bears no resemblance to any original Nor are such excessive refinements more agreeable in the epistolary or philosophic style, than in the epic or tragic Too much ornament is a fault in every kind of production Uncommon expressions, strong flashes of wit, pointed similes, and epigrammatic turns, especially when they recur too frequently, are a disfigurement rather than any embellishment of discourse As the eye, in surveying a Gothic building, is distracted by the multiplicity of ornaments, and loses the whole by its minute attention to the parts, so the mind, in perusing a work overstocked with wit, is fatigued and disgusted with the constant endeavour to shine and surprise This is the case where a writer overabounds in wit, even though that wit in itself, should be just and agreeable But it commonly happens to such writers, that they seek for their favourite ornaments, even where the subject does not afford them, and by that means have twenty insipid conceits for one thought which is really beautiful

There is no object in critical learning more copious, than this of the just mixture of simplicity and refinement in writing, and therefore, not to wander in too large a field, I shall confine myself to a few ge[neral] observations on that head

I I observe, *That though excesses of both kinds are to be avoided, and though a proper medium ought to be studied in all productions, yet this medium lies not in a point, but admits of a considerable latitude* Consider the wide distance, in this respect, between Pope and Lucretius These seem to lie in the two greatest extremes of refinement and simplicity in which a poet can indulge himself, without being guilty of any blameable excess All this interval may be filled with poets, who may differ from each other, but may be equally admirable, each in his peculiar style and manner Corneille and Congreve, who carry their wit and refinement somewhat farther than Pope, (if poets of so different a kind can be compared together), and Sophocles and Terence, who are more simple than Lucretius, seem to have gone out of that medium, in which the most perfect productions are found, and to be guilty of some excess in these opposite characters Of all the great poets, Virgil and Racine, in my opinion, lie nearest the centre, and are the farthest removed from both the extremities

II My observation on this head is, *that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to explain by words, where the just medium lies between the excesses of simplicity and refinement, or to give any rule by which we can know precisely the bounds between the fault and the beauty* A critic may not only discourse very judiciously on this head without instructing his readers, but even without understanding the matter perfectly himself There is not a finer piece of criticism than the *Dissertation on Pastorals* by Fontenelle, in which, by a number of reflections and philosophical reasonings, he endeavours to fix the just medium which is suitable to that species of writing But let any one read the pastorals of that author, and he will be convinced that this judicious critic, notwithstanding his fine reasonings, had a false taste, and fixed the point of perfection much nearer the extreme of refinement than pastoral poetry will admit of The sentiments of his shepherds are better suited to the toilettes of Paris than to the forests of Arcadia But this it is impossible to discover from his critical reasonings He blames all excessive painting and ornament as much as Virgil could have done, had that great poet writ a dissertation on this species of poetry However different the tastes of men, their general discourse on these subjects is commonly the same No criticism can be instructive which descends not to particulars, and is not full of examples and illustrations It is allowed on all hands, that beauty, as well as virtue, always lies in a medium, but where this medium is placed is a great question, and can never be sufficiently explained by general reasonings

III I shall deliver on this subject, *That we ought to be more on our guard against the excess of refinement than that of simplicity, and that because the former excess is both less* beautiful, *and more* dangerous *than the latter*

It is a certain rule, that wit and passion are entirely incompatible When the affections are moved, there is no place for the imagination. The mind of man being naturally limited, it is impossible that all its faculties can operate at once and the more any one predominates, the less room is there for the others to exert their vigour For this reason, a greater simplicity is required in all compositions, where men, and actions, and passions are painted, than in such as consist of reflections and observations And, as the former species of writing is the more engaging and beautiful, one may safely, upon this account give the preference to the extreme of simplicity above that of refinement.

We may also observe, that those compositions which we read the oftenest, and which every man of taste has got by heart, have the recommendation of simplicity, and have nothing surprising in the thought, when divested of that elegance of expression, and harmony of numbers, with which it is clothed If the merit of the composition lie in a

point of wit, it may strike at first; but the mind anticipates the thought in the second perusal, and is no longer affected by it. When I read an epigram of Martial, the first line recals the whole; and I have no pleasure in repeating to myself what I know already. But each line, each word in Catullus, has its merit; and I am never tired with the perusal of him. It is sufficient to run over Cowley once; but Parnel, after the fiftieth reading, is as fresh as at the first. Besides, it is with books as with women, where a certain plainness of manner and of dress is more engaging, than that glare of paint, and airs, and apparel, which may dazzle the eye, but reaches not the affections. Terence is a modest and bashful beauty, to whom we grant every thing, because he assumes nothing, and whose purity and nature make a durable though not a violent impression on us.

But refinement, as it the less *beautiful*, so is it the more *dangerous* extreme, and what we are the aptest to fall into. Simplicity passes for dulness, when it is not accompanied with great elegance and propriety. On the contrary, there is something surprising in a blaze of wit and conceit. Ordinary readers are mightily struck with it, and falsely imagine it to be the most difficult, as well as most excellent way of writing. Seneca abounds with agreeable faults, says Quintilian, *abundat dulcibus vitiis*; and for that reason is the more dangerous, and the more apt to pervert the taste of the young and the inconsiderate.

I shall add, that the excess of refinement is now more to be guarded against than ever; because it is the extreme, which men are the most apt to fall into, after learning has made some progress, and after eminent writers have appeared in every species of composition. The endeavour to please by novelty leads men wide of simplicity and nature, and fills their writings with affectation and conceit. It was thus the Asiatic eloquence degenerated so much from the Attic. It was thus the age of Claudius and Nero become so much inferior to that of Augustus in taste and genius. And perhaps there are, at present, some symptoms of a like degeneracy of taste, in France, as well as in England.

XX.—OF NATIONAL CHARACTERS.

THE vulgar are apt to carry all *national characters* to extremes; and, having once established it as a principle, that any people are knavish, or cowardly, or ignorant, they will admit of no exception, but comprehend every individual under the same censure. Men of sense condemn these undistinguishing judgments; though, at the same time, they

allow that each nation has a peculiar set of manners, and that some particular qualities are more frequently to be met with among one people than among their neighbours. The common people in Switzerland have probably more honesty than those of the same rank in Ireland; and every prudent man will, from that circumstance alone, make a difference in the trust which he reposes in each. We have reason to expect greater wit and gaiety in a Frenchman than in a Spaniard; though Cervantes was born in Spain. An Englishman will naturally be supposed to have more knowledge than a Dane; though Tycho Brahe was a native of Denmark.

Different reasons are assigned for these *national characters*, while some account for them from *moral*, others from *physical* causes. By *moral* causes, I mean all circumstances, which are fitted to work on the mind as motives or reasons, and which render a peculiar set of manners habitual to us. Of this kind are, the nature of the government, the revolutions of public affairs, the plenty or penury in which the people live, the situation of the nation with regard to its neighbours, and such like circumstances. By *physical* causes, I mean those qualities of the air and climate, which are supposed to work insensibly on the temper, by altering the tone and habit of the body, and giving a particular complexion, which, though reflection and reason may sometimes overcome it, will yet prevail among the generality of mankind, and have an influence on their manners.

That the character of a nation will much depend on *moral* causes, must be evident to the most superficial observer; since a nation is nothing but a collection of individuals, and the manners of individuals are frequently determined by these causes. As poverty and hard labour debase the minds of the common people, and render them unfit for any science and ingenious profession; so, where any government becomes very oppressive to all its subjects, it must have a proportional effect on their temper and genius, and must banish all the liberal arts from among them.

The same principle of moral causes fixes the character of different professions, and alters even that disposition, which the particular members receive from the hand of nature. A *soldier* and a *priest* are different characters, in all nations, and all ages; and this difference is founded on circumstances whose operation is eternal and unalterable.

The uncertainty of their life makes soldiers lavish and generous, as well as brave: their idleness, together with the large societies, which they form in camps or garrisons, inclines them to pleasure and gallantry: by their frequent change of company, they acquire good breeding and an openness of behaviour: being employed only against a public and an open enemy, they become candid, honest, and undesigning: and as

they use more the labour of the body than that of the mind, they are commonly thoughtless and ignorant.*

It is a trite, but not altogether a false maxim, that *priests of all religions are the same*; and though the character of the profession will not, in every instance, prevail over the personal character, yet it is sure always to predominate with the greater number. For as chemists observe, that spirits, when raised to a certain height, are all the same, from whatever materials they be extracted; so these men, being elevated above humanity, acquire a uniform character, which is entirely their own, and which, in my opinion, is, generally speaking, not the most amiable that is to be met with in human society. It is, in most points, opposite to that of a soldier; as is the way of life, from which it is derived.†

As to *physical causes*, I am inclined to doubt altogether of their operation in this particular; nor do I think that men owe anything of

* It is a saying of Menander, Κομψος στρατιωτης ουδ' αν ει πλαττει θεος Ουθεις γενοιτ' αν. Men. apud Stobaeum. *It is not in the power even of God to make a polite soldier.* The contrary observation with regard to the manners of soldiers takes place in our days. This seems to me a presumption that the ancients owed all their refinement and civility to books and study; for which, indeed, a soldier's life is not so well calculated. Company and the world is their sphere. And if there be any politeness to be learned from company, they will certainly have a considerable share of it.

† Though all mankind have a strong propensity to religion at certain times and in certain dispositions; yet are there few or none who have it to that degree, and with that constancy, which is requisite to support the character of this profession. It must therefore happen, that clergymen being drawn from the common mass of mankind, as people are to other employments, by the views of profit, the greater part will maintain the appearance of fervour and seriousness, even when jaded with the exercises of their religion, or when they have their minds engaged in the common occupations of life. They must not, like the rest of the world, give scope to their natural movements and sentiments. They must set a guard over their looks and words, and action.

Most men are ambitious; but the ambition of men may commonly be satisfied by excelling in their particular profession, and thereby promoting the interests of society.

Most men are apt to bear a particular regard for members of their own profession; but as a lawyer, or physician, or merchant, does each of them follow out his business apart, the interests of men of these professions are not so closely united as the interests of clergymen of the same religion; where the whole body gains by the veneration paid to their common tenets, and by the suppression of antagonists.

Few men can bear contradiction with patience; but the clergy too often proceed even to a degree of fury on this head. The *Odium Theologicum*, or Theological Hatred, is noted even to a proverb, and means that degree of rancour, which is the most furious and implacable.

Revenge is a natural passion to mankind; but seems to reign with the greatest force in priests and women: because, being deprived of the immediate exertion of anger, in violence and combat, they are apt to fancy themselves despised on that account; and their pride supports their vindictive disposition.

The temper of religion is grave and serious; and this is the character required of priests, which confines them to strict rules of decency, and commonly prevents irregularity and intemperance amongst them. The gaiety, much less the excesses of pleasure, is not permitted in that body; and this virtue is, perhaps, the only one which they owe to their profession. In religions, indeed, founded on speculative principles, and where public discourses make a part of religious service, it may also be supposed that the clergy will have a considerable share in the learning of the times; though it is certain that their taste in eloquence will always be greater than their proficiency in reasoning and philosophy. But whoever possesses the other noble virtues of humanity, meekness, and moderation, as very many of them, no doubt, do, is beholden for them by nature or reflection, not to the genius of his calling.

It was no bad expedient in the old Romans, for preventing the strong effect of the priestly character, to make it a law, that no one should be received into the sacerdotal office, till he was past fifty years of age. *Dion. Hal. lib. 1.* The living a layman till that age, it is presumed, would be able to fix the character.

their temper or genius to the air, food or climate. I confess, that the contrary opinion may justly, at first sight, seem probable, since we find, that these circumstances have an influence over every other animal, and that even those creatures, which are fitted to live in all climates, such as dogs, horses, &c, do not attain the same perfection in all. The courage of bull-dogs and game-cocks seems peculiar to England. Flanders is remarkable for large and heavy horses, Spain for horses light, and of good mettle. And any breed of these creatures, transplanted from one country to another, will soon lose the qualities, which they derived from their native climate. It may be asked, why not the same with men?*

There are few questions more curious than this, or which will oftener occur in our inquiries concerning human affairs; and therefore it may be proper to give it a full examination.

The human mind is of a very imitative nature; nor is it possible for any set of men to converse often together, without acquiring a similitude of manners, and communicating to each other their vices as well as virtues. The propensity to company and society is strong in all rational creatures; and the same disposition, which gives us this propensity, makes us enter deeply into each other's sentiments, and causes like passions and inclinations to run, as it were, by contagion, through the whole club or knot of companions. Where a number of men are united into one political body, the occasions of their intercourse must be so frequent, for defence, commerce, and government, that, together with the same speech or language, they must acquire a resemblance in their manners, and have a common or national character, as well as a personal one, peculiar to each individual. Now though nature produces all kinds of temper and understanding in great abundance, it does not follow, that she always produces them in like proportions, and that in every society the ingredients of industry and indolence, valour and cowardice, humanity and brutality, wisdom and folly, will be mixed after the same manner. In the infancy of society, if any of these dispositions be found in greater abundance than the rest, it will naturally prevail in the composition, and give a tincture to the national character. Or should it be asserted, that no species of temper can reasonably be presumed to predominate, even in those

* CÆSAR (*de Bello Gallico, lib.* 1.) says, that the Gallic horses were very good, the German very bad. We find in lib. vii. that he was obliged to mount some German cavalry with Gallic horses. At present no part of Europe has so bad horses of all kinds as France; but Germany abounds with excellent war horses. This may beget a little suspicion, that even animals depend not on the climate, but on the different breeds, and on the skill and care in rearing them. The north of England abounds in the best horses of all kinds which are perhaps in the world. In the neighbouring counties, north side of the Tweed, no good horses of any kind are to be met with. Strabo, lib. ii. rejects, in a great measure, the influence of climates upon men. All is custom and education, says he. It is not from nature, that the Athenians are learned, the Lacedemonians ignorant, and the Thebans too, who are still nearer neighbours to the former. Even the difference of animals, he adds, depends not on climate.

contracted societies, and that the same proportions will always be preserved in the mixture, yet surely the persons in credit and authority, being a still more contracted body, cannot always be presumed to be of the same character, and their influence on the manners of the people, must, at all times, be very considerable If on the first establishment of a republic, a Brutus should be placed in authority, and be transported with such an enthusiasm for liberty and public good, as to overlook all the ties of nature, as well as private interest, such an illustrious example will naturally have an effect on the whole society, and kindle the same passion in every bosom Whatever it be that forms the manners of one generation, the next must imbibe a deeper tincture of the same dye, men being more susceptible of all impressions during infancy, and retaining these impressions as long as they remain in the world I assert, then, that all national characters, where they depend not on fixed *moral* causes, proceed from such accidents as these, and that physical causes have no discernible operation on the human mind It is a maxim in all philosophy, that causes which do not appear, are to be considered as not existing

If we run over the globe, or revolve the annals of history, we shall discover every where signs of a sympathy or contagion of manners, none of the influence of air or climate

I We may observe, that where a very extensive government has been established for many centuries, it spreads a national character over the whole empire, and communicates to every part a similarity of manners Thus the Chinese have the greatest uniformity of character imaginable though the air and climate, in different parts of those vast dominions, admit of very considerable variations

II In small governments, which are contiguous, the people have notwithstanding a different character, and are often as distinguishable in their manners as the most distant nations. Athens and Thebes were but a short days journey from each other, though the Athenians were as remarkable for ingenuity, politeness and gaiety, as the Thebans for dulness, rusticity, and a phlegmatic temper Plutarch discoursing of the effects of air on the minds of men, observes, that the inhabitants of the Piræum possessed very different tempers from those of the higher town in Athens, which was distant about four miles from the former but I believe no one attributes the difference of manners in Wapping and St James', to a difference of air or climate.

III. The same national character commonly follows the authority of government to a precise boundary and upon crossing a river or passing a mountain, one finds a new set of manners, with a new government. The Languedocians and Gascons are the gayest people in France; but whenever you pass the Pyrenees, you are among Spaniards. Is it conceivable, that the qualities of the air should

change exactly with the limits of an empire, which depend so much on the accidents of battles, negociations, and marriages?

IV. Where any set of men, scattered over distant nations, maintain a close society or communication together, they acquire a similitude of manners, and have but little in common with the nations amongst whom they live. Thus the Jews in Europe, and the Armenians in the east, have a peculiar character; and the former are as much noted for fraud, as the latter for probity.* The *Jesuits* in all *Roman Catholic countries*, are also observed to have a character peculiar to themselves.

V. Where an accident, as a difference in language or religion, keeps two nations, inhabiting the same country, from mixing with each other, they will preserve, during several centuries, a distinct and even opposite set of manners. The integrity, gravity, and bravery of the Turks, form an exact contrast to the deceit, levity, and cowardice of the modern Greeks.

VI. The same set of manners will follow a nation, and adhere to them over the whole globe, as well as the same laws and language. The Spanish, English, French and Dutch colonies, are all distinguishable even between the tropics.

VII. The manners of a people change very considerably from one age to another, either by great alterations in their government, by the mixtures of new people, or by that inconstancy, to which all human affairs are subject. The ingenuity, industry, and activity of the ancient Greeks, have nothing in common with the stupidity and indolence of the present inhabitants of those regions. Candour, bravery, and love of liberty, formed the character of the ancient Romans; as subtlety, cowardice, and a slavish disposition do that of the modern. The old Spaniards were restless, turbulent, and so addicted to war, that many of them killed themselves, when deprived of their arms by the Romans. [TIT. LIVII, lib. xxxiv. cap. 17.] One would find an equal difficulty at present (at least one would have found it fifty years ago), to rouse up the modern Spaniards to arms. The Batavians were all soldiers of fortune, and hired themselves into the Roman armies. Their posterity make use of foreigners for the same purpose that the Romans did their ancestors. Though some few strokes of the French character be the same with that which Cæsar has ascribed to the Gauls; yet what comparison between the civility, humanity, and knowledge of the modern inhabitants of that country, and the ignorance, barbarity, and grossness of the ancient? Not to insist upon the great difference be-

* A small sect or society amidst a greater, are commonly most regular in their morals; because they are more remarked, and the faults of individuals draw dishonour on the whole. The only exception to this rule is, when the superstition and prejudices of the large society are so strong as to throw an infamy on the smaller society, independent of their morals. For in that case, having no character either to save or gain, they become careless of their behaviour, except among themselves.

tween the present possessors of Britain, and those before the Roman conquest we may observe that our ancestors, a few centuries ago, were sunk into the most abject superstition, last century they were inflamed with the most furious enthusiasm, and are now settled into the most cool indifference with regard to religious matters, that is to be found in any nation of the world

VIII Where several neighbouring nations have a very close communication together, either by policy, commerce, or travelling, they acquire a similitude of manners, proportioned to the communication. Thus all the Franks appear to have a uniform character to the eastern nations The differences among them are like the peculiar accents of different provinces, which are not distinguishable except by an ear accustomed to them and which commonly escape a foreigner

IX We may often remark a wonderful mixture of manners and characters in the same nation, speaking the same language, and subject to the same government and in this particular the English are the most remarkable of any people that perhaps ever were in the world Nor is this to be ascribed to the mutability and uncertainty of their climate, or to any other *physical* causes, since all these causes take place in the neighbouring country of Scotland, without having the same effect Where the government of a nation is altogether republican, it is apt to beget a peculiar set of manners Where it is altogether monarchical, it is more apt to have the same effect, the imitation of superiors spreading the national manners faster among the people If the governing part of a state consist altogether of merchants, as in Holland, their uniform way of life will fix their character If it consists chiefly of nobles and landed gentry, like Germany France, and Spain, the same effect follows The genius of a particular sect or religion is also apt to mould the manners of a people But the English government is a mixture of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy The people in authority are composed of gentry and merchants All sects of religion are to be found among them And the great liberty and independency, which every man enjoys, allows him to display the manners peculiar to him Hence the English, of any people in the universe, have the least of a national character, unless this very singularity may appear to pass for such

If the characters of men depended on the air and climate, the degrees of heat and cold should naturally be expected to have a mighty influence, since nothing has a greater effect on all plants and irrational animals And indeed there is some reason to think, that all the nations, which live beyond the polar circles or between the tropics, are inferior to the rest of the species, and are incapable of all the higher attainments of the human mind. The poverty and misery of the northern inhabitants of the globe, and the indolence of the southern, from their few necessities, may, perhaps, account for this remarkable difference,

without our having recourse to *physical* causes. This, however, is certain, that the characters of nations are very promiscuous in the temperate climates, and that almost all the general observations, which have been formed of the more southern or more northern people in these climates, are found to be uncertain and fallacious.*

Shall we say, that the neighbourhood of the sun inflames the imagination of men, and gives it a peculiar spirit and vivacity? The French, Greeks, Egyptians, and Persians, are remarkable for gaiety. The Spaniards, Turks, and Chinese, are noted for gravity and a serious deportment, without any such difference of climate as to produce this difference of temper.

The Greeks and Romans, who called all other nations barbarians, confined genius and a fine understanding to the more southern climates, and pronounced the northern nations incapable of all knowledge and civility. But our island has produced as great men, either for action or learning, as Greece or Italy has to boast of.

It is pretended, that the sentiments of men become more delicate as the country approaches nearer to the sun; and that the taste of beauty and elegance receives proportionable improvements in every latitude; as we particularly observe of the languages, of which the more southern are smooth and melodious, the northern harsh and untuneable. But this observation holds not universally. The Arabic is uncouth and disagreeable: the Muscovite soft and musical. Energy, strength, and harshness, form the character of the Latin tongue: the Italian is the most liquid, smooth, and effeminate language that can possibly be imagined. Every language will depend somewhat on the manners of the people; but much more on that original stock of words and sounds, which they received from their ancestors, and which remain unchangeable, even while their manners admit of the greatest alterations. Who can doubt, but the English are at present a more polite and knowing people than the Greeks were for several ages after the siege of Troy? Yet is there no comparison between the language of Milton and that of Homer. Nay, the greater are the alterations and improvements, which happen in the manners of a people, the less can be expected in their language. A few eminent and refined geniuses communicate their taste and knowledge to a whole people, and pro-

* I am apt to suspect the Negroes to be naturally inferior to the Whites. There scarcely ever was a civilized nation of that complexion, nor even any individual eminent either in action or speculation. No ingenious manufactures amongst them, no arts, no sciences. On the other hand, the most rude and barbarous of the Whites, such as the ancient Germans, the present Tartars, have still something eminent about them, in their valour, form of government, or some other particular. Such a uniform and constant difference could not happen, in so many countries and ages, if nature had not made an original distinction between these breeds of men. Not to mention our colonies, there are Negro slaves dispersed all over Europe, of whom none ever discovered any symptoms of ingenuity, though low people without education, will start up amongst us, and distinguish themselves in every profession. In Jamaica, indeed, they talk of one Negro as a man of parts and learning; but it is likely he is admired for slender accomplishments, like a parrot who speaks a few words plainly.

duce the greatest improvements, but they fix the tongue by their writings, and prevent, in some degree, its farther changes.

Lord Bacon has observed, that the inhabitants of the south are, in general, more ingenious than those of the north; but that, where the native of a cold climate has genius, he rises to a higher pitch than can be reached by the southern wits. This observation a late* writer confirms, by comparing the southern wits to cucumbers, which are commonly all good in their kind; but at best are an insipid fruit: while the northern geniuses are like melons, of which not one in fifty is good; but when it is so, it has an exquisite relish. I believe this remark may be allowed just, when confined to the European nations, and to the present age, or rather to the preceding one: but I think it may be accounted for from moral causes. All the sciences and liberal arts have been imported to us from the south; and it is easy to imagine, that, in the first order of application, when excited by emulation and by glory, the few, who were addicted to them, would carry them to the greatest height, and stretch every nerve, and every faculty, to reach the pinnacle of perfection. Such illustrious examples spread knowledge every where, and begot an universal esteem for the sciences: after which, it is no wonder that industry relaxes; while men meet not with suitable encouragement, nor arrive at such distinction by their attainments. The universal diffusion of learning among a people, and the entire banishment of gross ignorance and rusticity, is, therefore, seldom attended with any remarkable perfection in particular persons. It seems to be taken for granted in the dialogue *de Oratoribus*, that knowledge was much more common in Vespasian's age than in that of Cicero and Augustus. Quintilian also complains of the profanation of learning, by its becoming too common. 'Formerly,' says Juvenal, 'science was confined to Greece and Italy. Now the whole world emulates Athens and Rome. Eloquent Gaul has taught Britain, knowing in the laws. Even Thule entertains thoughts of hiring rhetoricians for its instruction.'† This state of learning is remarkable; because Juvenal is himself the last of the Roman writers that possessed any degree of genius. Those, who succeeded, are valued for nothing but the matters of fact, of which they give us information. I hope the late conversion of Muscovy to the study of the sciences will not prove a like prognostic to the present period of learning.

Cardinal Bentivoglio gives the preference to the northern nations above the southern with regard to candour and sincerity; and mentions, on the one hand, the Spaniards and Italians, and on the other,

* Dr Berkeley. Minute Philosopher.

† 'Sed Cantaber unde
Stoicus? Antiqui præsertim ætate Metelli.
Nunc totus Graias, nostrasque habet orbis Athenas.
Gallia causidicos docuit facunda Britannos:
De conducendo loquitur jam rhetore Thule.'—SAT. 15.

the Flemings and Germans. But I am apt to think, that this has happened by accident. The ancient Romans seem to have been a candid, sincere people, as are the modern Turks. But if we must needs suppose that this event has arisen from fixed causes, we may only conclude from it, that all extremes are apt to concur, and are commonly attended with the same consequences. Treachery is the usual concomitant of ignorance and barbarism; and if civilized nations ever embrace subtle and crooked politics, it is from an excess of refinement, which makes them disdain the plain and direct path to power and to glory.

Most conquests have gone from north to south; and it has hence been inferred, that the northern nations possess a superior degree of courage and ferocity. But it would have been juster to have said, that most conquests are made by poverty and want, upon plenty and riches. The Saracens, leaving the deserts of Arabia, carried their conquests northwards upon all the fertile provinces of the Roman empire; and met the Turks half way, who were coming southwards from the sterile deserts of Tartary.

An eminent writer* has remarked, that all courageous animals are also carnivorous, and that greater courage is to be expected in a people, such as the English, whose food is strong and hearty, than in the half-starved commonalty of other countries. But the Swedes, notwithstanding their disadvantages in this particular, are not inferior, in martial courage, to any nation that ever was in the world.

In general, we may observe, that courage, of all national qualities, is the most precarious; because it is exerted only at intervals, and by a few in every nation; whereas industry, knowledge, civility, may be of constant and universal use, and for several ages, may become habitual to the whole people. If courage be preserved, it must be by discipline, example, and opinion. The tenth legion of Cæsar, and the regiment of Picardy in France, were formed promiscuously from among the citizens; but having once entertained a notion, that they were the best troops in the service, this very opinion really made them such.

As a proof how much courage depends on opinion, we may observe, that, of the two chief tribes of the Greeks, the Dorians and Ionians, the former were always esteemed, and always appeared more brave and manly than the latter; though the colonies of both the tribes were interspersed and intermingled throughout all the extent of Greece, the Lesser Asia, Sicily, Italy, and the islands of the Ægean sea. The Athenians were the only Ionians that ever had any reputation for valour or military achievements; though even these were deemed inferior to the Lacedemonians, the bravest of the Dorians.

* Sir William Temple's account of the Netherlands.

The only observation, with regard to the difference of men in different climates, on which we can rest any weight, is the vulgar one, that people in the northern regions have a greater inclination to strong liquors, and those in the southern to love and women. One can assign a very probable *physical* cause for this difference. Wine and distilled waters warm the frozen blood in the colder climates, and fortify men against the injuries of the weather: as the genial heat of the sun, in the countries exposed to his beams, inflames the blood and exalts the passion between the sexes.

Perhaps, too, the matter may be accounted for by *moral* causes. All strong liquors are rarer in the north, and consequently are more coveted. Diodorus Siculus* tells us, that the Gauls in his time were great drunkards, and much addicted to wine; chiefly, I suppose, from its rarity and novelty. On the other hand, the heat in the southern climates, obliging men and women to go half naked, thereby renders their frequent commerce more dangerous, and inflames their mutual passion. This makes parents and husbands more jealous and reserved; which still farther inflames the passion. Not to mention, that as women ripen sooner in the southern regions, it is necessary to observe greater jealousy and care in their education; it being evident, that a girl of twelve cannot possess equal discretion to govern this passion, with one that feels not its violence till she be seventeen or eighteen. Nothing so much encourages the passion of love as ease and leisure, or is more destructive to it than industry and hard labour; and as the necessities of men are evidently fewer in the warm climates than in the cold ones, this circumstance alone may make a considerable difference between them.

But perhaps the fact is doubtful, that nature has, either from moral or physical causes, disturbed their respective inclination to the different climates. The ancient Greeks, though born in a warm climate, seem to have been much addicted to the bottle; nor were their parties of pleasure any thing but matches of drinking among men, who passed their time altogether apart from the fair. Yet when Alexander led the Greeks into Persia, a still more southern climate, they multiplied their debauches of this kind, in imitation of the Persian manners.† So honourable was the character of a drunkard among the Persians, that Cyrus the younger, soliciting the sober Lacedemonians for succour against his brother Artaxerxes, claims it chiefly on account of his superior endowments, as more valorous, more bountiful, and a better drinker. [Plut. Symp. lib. i. quæst. 4.] Darius Hystaspes made

* Lib. v. The same author ascribes taciturnity to that people; a new proof that national characters may alter very much. Taciturnity, as a national character, implies unsociableness. Aristotle, in his Politics, book ii. cap. 9. says, that the Gauls are the only warlike nation, who are negligent of women.

† *Babylonii maxime in vinum, et quæ ebrietatem sequuntur, effusi sunt.* Quint. Curt. lib. v. cap. 1.

it be inscribed on his tomb-stone, among his other virtues and princely qualities, that no one could bear a greater quantity of liquor. You may obtain any thing of the Negroes by offering them strong drink; and may easily prevail with them to sell, not only their children, but their wives and mistresses, for a cask of brandy. In France and Italy few drink pure wine, except in the greatest heats of summer; and, indeed, it is then almost as necessary, in order to recruit the spirits evaporated by heat, as it is in Sweden, during the winter, in order to warm the bodies congealed by the rigour of the season.

If jealousy be regarded as a proof of an amorous disposition, no people were more jealous than the Muscovites, before their communication with Europe had somewhat altered their manners in this particular.

But supposing the fact true, that nature, by physical principles, has regularly distributed these two passions, the one to the northern, the other to the southern regions; we can only infer, that the climate may affect the grosser and more bodily organs of our frame; not that it can work on those finer organs, on which the operations of the mind and understanding depend. And this is agreeable to the analogy of nature. The races of animals never degenerate when carefully attended; and horses, in particular, always show their blood in their shape, spirit, and swiftness: but a coxcomb may beget a philosopher; as a man of virtue may leave a worthless progeny.

I shall conclude this subject with observing, that though the passion for liquor be more brutal and debasing than love, which, when properly managed, is the source of all politeness and refinement; yet this gives not so great an advantage to the southern climates, as we may be apt, at first sight, to imagine. When love goes beyond a certain pitch, it renders men jealous, and cuts off the free intercourse between the sexes, on which the politeness of a nation will commonly much depend. And if we would subtilize and refine upon this point, we might observe, that the people in very temperate climates, are the most likely to attain all sorts of improvement; their blood not being so inflamed as to render them jealous, and yet being warm enough to make them set a due value on the charms and endowments of the fair sex.

XXI.—OF TRAGEDY

It seems an unaccountable pleasure, which the spectators of a well-written tragedy receive from sorrow, terror, anxiety, and other passions that are in themselves disagreeable and uneasy. The more they

are touched and affected, the more are they delighted with the spectacle; and as soon as the uneasy passions cease to operate, the piece is at an end. One scene of full joy and contentment and security, is the utmost that any composition of this kind can bear; and it is sure always to be the concluding one. If in the texture of the piece, there be interwoven any scenes of satisfaction, they afford only faint gleams of pleasure, which are thrown in by way of variety, and in order to plunge the actors into deeper distress by means of that contrast and disappointment. The whole art of the poet is employed, in rousing and supporting the compassion and indignation, the anxiety and resentment, of his audience. They are pleased in proportion as they are afflicted, and never are so happy as when they employ tears, sobs, and cries, to give vent to their sorrow, and relieve their heart, swollen with the tenderest sympathy and compassion.

The few critics who have had some tincture of philosophy, have remarked this singular phenomenon, and have endeavoured to account for it.

L'Abbe Dubos, in his reflections on poetry and painting, asserts, that nothing is in general so disagreeable to the mind as the languid, listless state of indolence, into which it falls upon the removal of all passion and occupation. To get rid of this painful situation, it seeks every amusement and pursuit; business, gaming, shows, executions; whatever will rouse the passions and take its attention from itself. No matter what the passion is, let it be disagreeable, afflicting, melancholy, disordered; it is still better than that insipid langour, which arises from perfect tranquillity and repose.

It is impossible not to admit this account, as being, at least in part, satisfactory. You may observe when there are several tables of gaming, that all the company run to those, where the deepest play is, even though they find not there the best players. The view, or, at least imagination of high passions, arising from great loss or gain, affects the spectator by sympathy, gives him some touches of the same passions, and serves him for a momentary entertainment. It makes the time pass the easier with him, and is some relief to that oppression, under which men commonly labour, when left entirely to their own thoughts and meditations.

We find that common liars always magnify, in their narration, all kinds of danger, pain, distress, sickness, deaths, murders, and cruelties; as well as joy, beauty, mirth, and magnificence. It is an absurd secret, which they have for pleasing their company, fixing their attention, and attaching them to such marvellous relations, by the passions and emotions which they excite.

There is, however, a difficulty in applying to the present subject, in its full extent, this solution, however ingenious and satisfactory it may appear. It is certain that the same object of distress, which

pleases in a tragedy, were it really set before us, would give the most unfeigned uneasiness; though it be then the most effectual cure to langour and indolence. Fontenelle seems to have been sensible of this difficulty, and accordingly attempts another solution of the phenomenon; at least makes some addition to the theory above-mentioned. [Reflections sur la Poetique, § 36.]

'Pleasure and pain,' says he, 'which are two sentiments so different 'in themselves, differ not so much in their cause. From the instance of 'tickling, it appears, that the movement of pleasure, pushed a little too 'far, becomes pain; and that the movement of pain, a little moderate, 'becomes pleasure. Hence it proceeds, that there is such a thing as 'sorrow, soft and agreeable: it is a pain weakened and diminished. 'The heart likes naturally to be moved and affected. Melancholy 'objects suit it, and even disastrous and sorrowful, provided they are 'softened by some circumstance. It is certain that, on the theatre, 'the representation has always the effect of reality; yet it has not 'altogether that effect. However we may be hurried away by the 'spectacle; whatever dominion the sense and imagination may 'usurp over the reason, there still lurks at the bottom a certain idea, 'of falsehood in the whole of what we see. This idea, though weak 'and disguised, suffices to diminish the pain which we suffer from 'the misfortunes of those whom we love, and to reduce that affliction 'to such a pitch as converts it into a pleasure. We weep for the 'misfortune of a hero, to whom we are attached. In the same instant 'we comfort ourselves, by reflecting, that it is nothing but a fiction: 'and it is precisely that mixture of sentiments, which composes an 'agreeable sorrow, and tears that delight us. But as that affliction, 'which is caused by exterior and sensible objects, is stronger than 'the consolation which arises from an internal reflection, they are 'the effects and symptoms of sorrow, that ought to predominate in 'the composition.'

This solution seems just and convincing; but perhaps it wants still some new addition, in order to make it answer fully the phenomenon, which we here examine. All the passions, excited by eloquence, are agreeable in the highest degree, as well as those which are moved by painting and the theatre. The Epilogues of Cicero are, on this account, chiefly, the delight of every reader of taste; and it is difficult to read some of them without the deepest sympathy and sorrow. His merit as an orator, no doubt, depends much on his success in this particular. When he had raised tears in his judges and all his audience, they where then the most highly delighted and expressed the greatest satisfaction with the pleader. The pathetic description of the butchery, made by Verres of the Sicilian captains, is a master-piece of this kind; but I believe none will affirm, that the being present at a melancholy scene of that nature would afford any enter-

tainment. Neither is the sorrow here softened by fiction: for the audience were convinced of the reality of every circumstance. What is it, then, which in this case raises a pleasure from the bosom of uneasiness, so to speak; and a pleasure, which retains all the features and outward symptoms of distress and sorrow?

I answer: this extraordinary effect proceeds from that very eloquence, with which the melancholy scene is represented. The genius required to paint objects in a lively manner, the art employed in collecting all the pathetic circumstances, the judgment displayed in disposing them: the exercise, I say, of these noble talents, together with the force of expression, and beauty of oratorial numbers, diffuse the highest satisfaction on the audience, and excite the most delightful movements. By this means, the uneasiness of the melancholy passions is not only overpowered and effaced by something stronger of an opposite kind; but the whole impulse of those passions is converted into pleasure, and swells the delight which the eloquence raises in us. The same force of oratory, employed on an uninteresting subject, would not please half so much, or rather would appear altogether ridiculous; and the mind, being left in absolute calmness and indifference, would relish none of those beauties of imagination or expression, which, if joined to passion, give it such exquisite entertainment. The impulse or vehemence, arising from sorrow, compassion, indignation, receives a new direction from these sentiments of beauty. The latter, being the predominant motion, seize the whole mind, and convert the former into themselves, at least tincture them so strongly as totally to alter their nature. And the soul, being, at the same time, roused by passion, and charmed by eloquence, feels, on the whole, a strong movement, which is altogether delightful.

The same principle takes place in tragedy; with this addition, that tragedy is an imitation; and imitation is always of itself agreeable. This circumstance serves still farther to smooth the motions of passion, and convert the whole feeling into one uniform and strong enjoyment. Objects of the greatest terror and distress please in painting, and please more than the most beautiful objects, that appear calm and indifferent.* The affection, rousing the mind, excites a large stock of spirit and vehemence; which is all transformed into pleasure by the force of the prevailing movement. It is thus the fiction of tragedy softens the passion, by an infusion of a new feeling, not merely by weakening or diminishing the sorrow. You may by degrees weaken a real sorrow,

* Painters make no scruple of representing distress and sorrow as well as any other passion: but they seem not to dwell so much on these melancholy affections as the poets, who, though they copy every motion of the human breast, yet pass quickly over the agreeable sentiments. A painter represents only one instant; and if that be passionate enough, it is sure to affect and delight the spectator: but nothing can furnish to the poet a variety of scenes, and incidents, and sentiments, except distress, terror, or anxiety. Complete joy and satisfaction is attended with security, and leaves no farther room for action.

till it totally disappears, yet in none of its gradations will it ever give pleasure, except, perhaps, by accident, to a man sunk under lethargic indolence, whom it rouses from that languid state.

To confirm this theory, it will be sufficient to produce other instances, where the subordinate movement is converted into the predominant, and gives force to it, though of a different, and even sometimes though of a contrary nature.

Novelty naturally rouses the mind, and attracts our attention, and the movements, which it causes are always converted into any passion belonging to the object, and join their force to it. Whether an event excite joy or sorrow, pride or shame, anger or good-will, it is sure to produce a stronger affection, when new or unusual. And though novelty of itself be agreeable, it fortifies the painful, as well as the agreeable passions.

Had you any intention to move a person extremely by the narration of any event, the best method of increasing its effect would be artfully to delay informing him of it, and first to excite his curiosity and impatience before you let him into the secret. This is the artifice practised by Iago in the famous scene of Shakespeare; and every spectator is sensible, that Othello's jealousy acquires additional force from his preceding impatience, and that the subordinate passion is here readily transformed into the predominant one.

Difficulties increase passions of every kind; and by rousing our attention, and exciting our active powers, they produce an emotion, which nourishes the prevailing affection.

Parents commonly love that child most whose sickly, infirm frame of body, has occasioned them the greatest pains, trouble, and anxiety, in rearing him. The agreeable sentiment of affection here acquires force from sentiments of uneasiness.

Nothing endears so much a friend as sorrow for his death. The pleasure of his company has not so powerful an influence.

Jealousy is a painful passion; yet without some share of it, the agreeable affection of love has difficulty to subsist in its full force and violence. Absence is also a great source of complaint among lovers, and gives them the greatest uneasiness: yet nothing is more favourable to their mutual passion than short intervals of that kind. And if long intervals often prove fatal, it is only because, through time, men are accustomed to them, and they cease to give uneasiness. Jealousy and absence in love compose the *dolce piccante* of the Italians, which they suppose so essential to all pleasure.

There is a fine observation of the elder Pliny, which illustrates the principle here insisted on. 'It is very remarkable' says he, 'that the last works of celebrated artists, which they left imperfect, are always the most prized, such as the IRIS of Aristides, the TYNDARIDES of Nicomachus, the MEDEA of Timomachus, and the VENUS of Apelles.'

These are valued even above their finished productions, The broken lineaments of the piece, and the half formed idea of the painter, are carefully studied, and our very grief for that curious hand, which had been stopped by death, is an additional increase to our pleasure *

These instances (and many more might be collected) are sufficient to afford us some insight into the analogy of nature, and to show us, that the pleasure which poets, orators and musicians give us, by exciting grief, sorrow, indignation, compassion, is not so extraordinary or paradoxical as it may at first sight appear The force of imagination, the energy of expression, the power of numbers, the charms of imitation, all these are naturally, of themselves, delightful to the mind and when the object presented lays also hold of some affection, the pleasure still rises upon us, by the conversion of this subordinate movement into that which is predominant The passion, though perhaps naturally, and when excited by the simple appearance of a real object, it may be painful, yet is so smoothed, and softened, and mollified, when raised by the finer arts, that it affords to us the highest entertainment.

To confirm this reasoning, we may observe, that if the movements of the imagination be not predominant above those of the passion, a contrary effect follows, and the former, being now subordinate, is converted into the latter, and still farther increases the pain and affliction of the sufferer

Who could ever think of it as a good expedient for comforting an afflicted parent, to exaggerate, with all the force of elocution, the irreparable loss which he has met with by the death of a favourite child? The more power of imagination and expression you here employ, the more you increase his despair and affliction

The shame, confusion, and terror of Verres, no doubt, rose in proportion to the noble eloquence and vehemence of Cicero so also did his pain and uneasiness These former passions were too strong for the pleasure arising from the beauties of elocution, and operated, though from the same principle, yet in a contrary manner, to the sympathy, compassion, and indignation of the audience

Lord Clarendon, when he approaches towards the catastrophe of the royal party, supposes that his narration must then become infinitely disagreeable and he hurries over the King's death without giving us one circumstance of it. He considers it as too horrid a scene to be contemplated with any satisfaction, or even without the utmost pain and aversion He himself, as well as the readers of that age, were too deeply concerned in the events, and felt a pain from

* Illud vero perquam rarum ac memoria dignum, etiam suprema opera artificum, imperfectasque tabulas, sicut, IRIN Aristidis, TYNDARIDAS Nicomachi, MEDEAM Timomachi, et quam diximus VENEREM Apellis, in majori admiratione esse quam perfecta. Quippe in iis lineamenta reliqua, ipsaeque cogitationes artificum spectantur, atque in lenocinio commendationis dolor est manus, cum id ageret, extinctae.—Lib xxxv cap. 11.

subjects, which an historian and a reader of another age would regard as the most pathetic and the most interesting, and, by consequence, the most agreeable.

An action, represented in tragedy, may be too bloody and atrocious. It may excite such movements of horror as will not soften into pleasure; and the greatest energy of expression, bestowed on descriptions of that nature, serves only to augment our uneasiness. Such is that action represented in the *Ambitious Stepmother*, where a venerable old man, raised to the height of fury and despair, rushes against a pillar, and, striking his head upon it, besmears it all over with mingled brains and gore. The English theatre abounds too much with such shocking images.

Even the common sentiments of compassion require to be softened by some agreeable affection, in order to give a thorough satisfaction to the audience. The mere suffering of plaintive virtue, under the triumphant tyranny and oppression of vice, forms a disagreeable spectacle, and is carefully avoided by all masters of the drama. In order to dismiss the audience with entire satisfaction and contentment, the virtue must either convert itself into a noble courageous despair, or the vice receive its proper punishment.

Most painters appear in this light to have been very unhappy in their subjects. As they wrought much for churches and convents, they have chiefly represented such horrible subjects as crucifixions and martyrdoms, where nothing appears but tortures, wounds, executions, and passive suffering, without any action or affection. When they turned their pencil from this ghastly mythology, they had commonly recourse to Ovid, whose fictions, though passionate and agreeable, are scarcely natural or probable enough for painting.

The same inversion of that principle, which is here insisted on, displays itself in common life, as in the effects of oratory and poetry. Raise so the subordinate passion that it becomes the predominant, it swallows up that affection which it before nourished and increased. Too much jealousy extinguishes love. Too much difficulty renders us indifferent: too much sickness and infirmity disgusts a selfish and unkind parent.

What so disagreeable as the dismal, gloomy, disastrous stories, with which melancholy people entertain their companions? The uneasy passion being there raised alone, unaccompanied with any spirit, genius, or eloquence, conveys a pure uneasiness, and is attended with nothing that can soften it into pleasure or satisfaction.

XXII.—OF THE STANDARD OF TASTE.

THE great variety of Taste, as well as of opinion, which prevails in the world, is too obvious not to have fallen under every one's observation. Men of the most confined knowledge are able to remark a difference of taste in the narrow circle of their acquaintance, even where the persons have been educated under the same government, and have early imbibed the same prejudices. But those, who can enlarge their view to contemplate distant nations and remote ages, are still more surprised at the great inconsistence and contrariety. We are apt to call *barbarous* whatever departs widely from our own taste and apprehension; but soon find the epithet of reproach retorted on us. And the highest arrogance and self-conceit is at last startled, on observing an equal assurance on all sides, and scruples, amidst such a contest of sentiment, to pronounce positively in its own favour.

As this variety of taste is obvious to the most careless inquirer, so will it be found, on examination, to be still greater in reality than in appearance. The sentiments of men often differ with regard to beauty and deformity of all kinds, even while their general discourse is the same. There are certain terms in every language, which import blame, and others praise; and all men, who use the same tongue, must agree in their application of them. Every voice is united in applauding elegance, propriety, simplicity, spirit in writing; and in blaming fustian, affectation, coldness, and a false brilliancy: but when critics come to particulars, this seeming unanimity vanishes; and it is found, that they had affixed a very different meaning to their expressions. In all matters of opinion and science, the case is opposite: the difference among men is there oftener found to lie in generals than in particulars; and to be less in reality than in appearance. An explanation of the terms commonly ends the controversy; and the disputants are surprised to find, that they had been quarrelling, while at bottom they agreed in their judgment.

Those who found morality on sentiment, more than on reason, are inclined to comprehend ethics under the former observation, and to maintain, that, in all questions, which regard conduct and manners, the difference among men is really greater than at first sight it appears. It is indeed obvious, that writers of all nations and all ages concur in applauding justice, humanity, magnanimity, prudence, veracity; and in blaming the opposite qualities. Even poets and other authors, whose compositions are chiefly calculated to please the imagination, are yet found, from Homer down to Fenelon, to inculcate the same moral precepts, and to bestow their applause and blame on the same virtues and vices. This great unanimity is usually ascribed to the

influence of plain reason; which, in all these cases, maintains similar sentiments in all men, and prevents those controversies, to which the abstracts are so much exposed. So far as the unanimity is real, this account may be admitted as satisfactory: but we must also allow, that some part of the seeming harmony in morals may be accounted for from the very nature of language. The word *virtue*, with its equivalent in every tongue, implies praise; as that of *vice* does blame: and no man, without the most obvious and grossest impropriety, could affix reproach to a term, which in general acceptation is understood in a good sense; or bestow applause, where the idiom requires disapprobation. Homer's general precepts, where he delivers any such, will never be controverted; but it is obvious, that, when he draws particular pictures of manners, and represents heroism in Achilles and prudence in Ulysses, he intermixes a much greater degree of ferocity in the former, and of cunning and fraud in the latter, than Fenelon would admit of. The sage Ulysses in the Greek poet seems to delight in lies and fictions, and often employs them without any necessity or even advantage: but his more scrupulous son, in the French epic writer, exposes himself to the most imminent perils, rather than depart from the most exact line of truth and veracity.

The admirers and followers of the Alcoran insist on the excellent moral precepts interspersed through that wild and absurd performance. But it is to be supposed, that the Arabic words, which correspond to the English, equity, justice, temperance, meekness, charity, were such as, from the constant use of that tongue, must always be taken in a good sense; and it would have argued the greatest ignorance, not of morals, but of language, to have mentioned them with any epithets, besides those of applause and approbation. But would we know whether the pretended prophet had really attained a just sentiment of morals? Let us attend to his narration; and we shall soon find, that he bestows praise on such instances of treachery, inhumanity, cruelty, revenge, bigotry, as are utterly incompatible with civilized society. No steady rule of right seems there to be attended to; and every action is blamed or praised, so far only as it is beneficial or hurtful to the true believers.

The merit of delivering true general precepts in ethics is indeed very small. Whoever recommends any moral virtues, really does no more than is implied in the terms themselves. That people, who invented the word *charity*, and used it in a good sense, inculcated more clearly and much more efficaciously, the precept, *be charitable*, than any pretended legislator or prophet, who should insert such a *maxim* in his writings. Of all expressions, those, which, together with their other meaning, imply a degree either of blame or approbation, are the least liable to be perverted or mistaken.

It is natural for us to seek a *Standard of Taste*, a rule, by which

the various sentiments of men may be reconciled; at least, a decision afforded, confirming one sentiment, and condemning another.

There is a species of philosophy, which cuts off all hopes of success in such an attempt, and represents the impossibility of ever attaining any standard of taste. The difference, it is said, is very wide between judgment and sentiment. All sentiment is right; because sentiment has a reference to nothing beyond itself, and is always real, wherever a man is conscious of it. But all determinations of the understanding are not right; because they have a reference to something beyond themselves, to wit, real matter of fact; and are not always conformable to that standard. Among a thousand different opinions which different men may entertain of the same subject, there is one, and but one, that is just and true; and the only difficulty is to fix and ascertain it. On the contrary, a thousand different sentiments, excited by the same object, are all right: because no sentiment represents what is really in the object. It only marks a certain conformity or relation between the object and the organs or faculties of the mind; and if that conformity did not really exist, the sentiment could never possibly have being. Beauty is no quality in things themselves: it exists merely in the mind which contemplates them; and each mind perceives a different beauty. One person may even perceive deformity, where another is sensible of beauty; and every individual ought to acquiesce in his own sentiment, without pretending to regulate those of others. To seek the real beauty, or real deformity, is as fruitless an inquiry, as to pretend to ascertain the real sweet or real bitter. According to the disposition of the organs, the same object may be both sweet and bitter; and the proverb has justly determined it to be fruitless to dispute concerning tastes. It is very natural, and even quite necessary, to extend this axiom to mental, as well as bodily taste; and thus common sense, which is so often at variance with philosophy, especially with the sceptical kind, is found, in one instance at least, to agree in pronouncing the same decision.

But though this axiom, by passing into a proverb, seems to have attained the sanction of common sense; there is certainly a species of common sense, which opposes it, at least serves to modify and restrain it. Whoever would assert an equality of genius and elegance between Ogilby and Milton, or Bunyan and Addison, would be thought to defend no less an extravagance, than if he had maintained a molehill to be as high as Teneriffe, or a pond as extensive as the ocean. Though there may be found persons, who give the preference to the former authors; no one pays attention to such a taste; and we pronounce, without scruple, the sentiment of these pretended critics to be absurd and ridiculous. The principle of the natural equality of tastes is then totally forgot, and while we admit it on some occasions,

here the objects seem near an equality, it appears an extravagant aradox, or rather a palpable absurdity, where objects so disproortioned are compared together

It is evident that none of the rules of composition are fixed by asonings *a priori*, or can be esteemed abstract conclusions of the nderstanding, from comparing those habitudes and relations of ideas, hich are eternal and immutable Their foundation is the same ith that of all the practical sciences, experience, nor are there any ing but general observations concerning what has been universally und to please in all countries and in all ages Many of the beauties f poetry, and even of eloquence, are founded on falsehood and ction on hyperboles, metaphors, and an abuse or perversion of ims from their natural meaning To check the sallies of the nagination, and to reduce every expression to geometrical truth and xactness, would be the most contrary to the laws of criticism, beause it would produce a work, which, by universal experience, has een found the most insipid and disagreeable But though poetry an never submit to exact truth, it must be confined by rules of art, iscovered to the author either by genius or observation If some egligent or irregular writers have pleased, they have not pleased by eir trangessions of rule or order, but in spite of these transgres ons they have possessed other beauties, which were conformable just criticism, and the force of these beauties has been able to overower censure, and give the mind a satisfaction superior to the disgust ising from the blemishes Ariosto pleases, but not by his monrous and improbable fictions, by his bizarre mixture of the serious nd comic styles, by the want of coherence in his stories, or by the ontinual interruptions of his narration He charms by the force and learness of his expression, by the readiness and variety of his invenons, and by his natural pictures of the passions, especially those of e gay and amorous kind and however his faults may diminish our tisfaction, they are not able entirely to destroy it Did our pleasure ally arise from those parts of his poem, which we denominate faults, is would be no objection to criticism in general it would only be objection to those particular rules of criticism, which would esblish such circumstances to be faults, and would represent them universally blameable If they are found to please, they cannot e faults, let the pleasure, which they produce, be ever so unexpected and unaccountable

But though all the general rules of art are founded only on experience, nd on the observation of the common sentiments of human nature, e must not imagine, that, on every occasion, the feelings of men will e conformable to these rules. Those finer emotions of the mind are f a very tender and delicate nature, and require the concurrence of any favourable circumstances to make them play with facility and

exactness, according to their general and established principles. The least exterior hindrance to such small springs, or the least internal disorder, disturbs their motion, and confounds the operation of the whole machine. When we would make an experiment of this nature, and would try the force of any beauty or deformity, we must choose with care a proper time and place, and bring the fancy to a suitable situation and disposition. A perfect serenity of mind, a recollection of thought, a due attention to the object; if any of these circumstances be wanting, our experiment will be fallacious, and we shall be unable to judge of the catholic and universal beauty. The relation, which nature has placed between the form and the sentiment, will at least be more obscure; and it will require greater accuracy to trace and discern it. We shall be able to ascertain its influence, not so much from the operation of each particular beauty, as from the durable admiration, which attends those works, that have survived all the caprices of mode and fashion, all the mistakes of ignorance and envy.

The same Homer, who pleased at Athens and Rome two thousand years ago, is still admired at Paris and at London. All the changes of climate, government, religion, and language, have not been able to obscure his glory. Authority or prejudice may give a temporary vogue to a bad poet or orator; but his reputation will never be durable or general. When his compositions are examined by posterity or by foreigners, the enchantment is dissipated, and his faults appear in their true colours. On the contrary, a real genius, the longer his works endure, and the more wide they are spread, the more sincere is the admiration which he meets with. Envy and jealousy have too much place in a narrow circle; and even familiar acquaintance with his person may diminish the applause due to his performances: but when these obstructions are removed, the beauties, which are naturally fitted to excite agreeable sentiments, immediately display their energy; and while the world endures, they maintain their authority over the minds of men.

It appears then, that, amidst all the variety and caprice of taste, there are certain general principles of approbation or blame, whose influence a careful eye may trace in all operations of the mind. Some particular forms or qualities, from the original structure of the internal fabric, are calculated to please, and others to displease; and if they fail of their effect in any particular instance, it is from some apparent defect or imperfection in the organ. A man in a fever would not insist on his palate as able to decide concerning flavours; nor would one, affected with the jaundice, pretend to give a verdict with regard to colours. In each creature, there is a sound and a defective state; and the former alone can be supposed to afford us a true standard of taste and sentiment. If, in the sound state of the organ, there be an entire or a considerable uniformity of sentiment among men, we may thence

derive an idea of the perfect beauty, in like manner as the appearance of objects in day-light, to the eye of a man in health, is denominated their true and real colour, even while colour is allowed to be merely a phantasm of the senses

Many and frequent are the defects in the internal organs, which prevent or weaken the influence of those general principles, on which depends our sentiment of beauty or deformity Though some objects, by the structure of the mind, be naturally calculated to give pleasure, it is not to be expected, that in every individual the pleasure will be equally felt Particular incidents and situations occur, which either throw a false light on the objects, or hinder the true from conveying to the imagination the proper sentiment and perception

One obvious cause, why many feel not the proper sentiment of beauty, is the want of that *delicacy* of imagination, which is requisite to convey a sensibility of those finer emotions This delicacy every one pretends to every one talks of it, and would reduce every kind of taste or sentiment to its standard But as our intention in this essay is to mingle some light of the understanding with the feelings of sentiment, it will be proper to give a more accurate definition of delicacy than has hitherto been attempted And not to draw our philosophy from too profound a source, we shall have recourse to a noted story in Don Quixote

It is with good reason, says Sancho to the squire with the great nose, that I pretend to have a judgment in wine this is a quality hereditary in our family Two of my kinsmen were once called to give their opinion of a hogshead, which was supposed to be excellent, being old and of a good vintage One of them tastes it, considers it, and after mature reflection, pronounces the wine to be good, were it not for a small taste of leather, which he perceived in it The other, after using the same precautions, gives also his verdict in favour of the wine, but with the reserve of a taste of iron, which he could easily distinguish You cannot imagine how much they were both ridiculed for their judgment But who laughed in the end? On emptying the hogshead there was found at the bottom an old key with a leathern thong tied to it.

The great resemblance between mental and bodily taste will easily teach us to apply this story Though it be certain, that beauty and deformity, more than sweet and bitter, are not qualities in objects but belong entirely to the sentiment, internal or external, it must be allowed, that there are certain qualities in objects, which are fitted by nature to produce those particular feelings Now as these qualities may be found in a small degree, or may be mixed and confounded with each other, it often happens that the taste is not affected with such minute qualities, or is not able to distinguish all the particular flavours, amidst the disorder in which they are presented. Where the

organs are so fine as to allow nothing to escape them, and at the same time so exact, as to perceive every ingredient in the composition this we call delicacy of taste, whether we employ these terms in the literal or metaphorical sense Here then the general rules of beauty are of use, being drawn from established models, and from the observation of what pleases or displeases, when presented singly and in a high degree and if the same qualities, in a continued composition, and in a smaller degree, affect not the organs with a sensible delight or uneasiness, we exclude the person from all pretensions to this delicacy To produce these general rules or avowed patterns of composition, is like finding the key with the leathern thong, which justified the verdict of Sancho's kinsmen, and confounded those pretended judges who had condemned them Though the hogshead had never been emptied, the taste of the one was still equally delicate, and that of the other equally dull and languid but it would have been more difficult to have proved the superiority of the former, to the conviction of every bye-stander In like manner, though the beauties of writing had never been methodized, or reduced to general principles, though no excellent models had ever been acknowledged, the different degrees of taste would still have subsisted, and the judgment of one man been preferable to that of another, but it would not have been so easy to silence the bad critic, who might always insist upon his particular sentiment, and refuse to submit to his antagonist But when we show him an avowed principle of art, when we illustrate this principle by examples, whose operation, from his own particular taste, he acknowledges to be conformable to the principle, when we prove that the same principle may be applied to the present case, where he did not perceive or feel its influence he must conclude, upon the whole, that the fault lies in himself, and that he wants the delicacy which is requisite to make him sensible of every beauty and every blemish, in any composition or discourse

It is acknowledged to be the perfection of every sense or faculty, to perceive with exactness its most minute objects, and allow nothing to escape its notice and observation The smaller the objects are, which become sensible to the eye, the finer is that organ, and the more elaborate its make and composition A good palate is not tried by strong flavours, but a mixture of small ingredients, where we are still sensible of each part, notwithstanding its minuteness and its confusion with the rest In like manner, a quick and acute perception of beauty and deformity must be the perfection of our mental taste, nor can a man be satisfied with himself while he suspects that any excellence or blemish in a discourse has passed him unobserved In this case, the perfection of the man, and the perfection of the sense or feeling, are found to be united A very delicate palate, on many occasions, may be a great inconvenience both to a man himself and to his friends but a

delicate taste of wit or beauty must always be a desirable quality, because it is the source of all the finest and most innocent enjoyments of which human nature is susceptible In this decision the sentiments of all mankind are agreed Wherever you can ascertain a delicacy of taste, it is sure to meet with approbation, and the best way of ascertaining it is to appeal to those models and principles which have been established by the uniform consent and experience of nations and ages

But though there be naturally a wide difference in point of delicacy between one person and another, nothing tends further to increase and improve this talent, than *practice* in a particular art, and the frequent survey or contemplation of a particular species of beauty When objects of any kind are first presented to the eye or imagination the sentiment which attends them is obscure and confused, and the mind is, in a great measure, incapable of pronouncing concerning their merits or defects The taste cannot perceive the several excellencies of the performance, much less distinguish the particular character of each excellency, and ascertain its quality and degree If it pronounce the whole in general to be beautiful or deformed it is the utmost that can be expected, and even this judgment, a person so unpractised will be apt to deliver with great hesitation and reserve But allow him to acquire experience in those objects, his feeling becomes more exact and nice he not only perceives the beauties and defects of each part but marks the distinguishing species of each quality and assigns it suitable praise or blame A clear and distinct sentiment attends him through the whole survey of the objects, and he discerns that very degree and kind of approbation or displeasure which each part is naturally fitted to produce The mist dissipates which seemed formerly to hang over the object the organ acquires greater perfection in its operations, and can pronounce without danger or mistake, concerning the merits of every performance In a word, the same address and dexterity, which practice gives to the execution of any work, is also acquired by the same means, in the judging of it

So advantageous is practice to the discernment of beauty, that, before we can give judgment on any work of importance, it will even be requisite that that very individual performance be more than once perused by us, and be surveyed in different lights with attention and deliberation There is a flutter or hurry of thought which attends the first perusal of any piece, and which confounds the genuine sentiment of beauty The relation of the parts is not discerned the true characters of style are little distinguished. The several perfections and defects seem wrapped up in a species of confusion, and present themselves indistinctly to the imagination Not to mention, that there is a species of beauty, which, as it is florid and superficial, pleases at first; but being found incompatible with a just expression either of reason

or passion, soon palls upon the taste, and is then rejected with disdain, at least rated at a much lower value.

It is impossible to continue in the practice of contemplating any order of beauty, without being frequently obliged to form *comparisons* between the several species and degrees of excellence, and estimating their proportion to each other. A man, who has had no opportunity of comparing the different kinds of beauty, is indeed totally unqualified to pronounce an opinion with regard to any object presented to him. By comparison alone we fix the epithets of praise or blame, and learn how to assign the due degree of each. The coarsest daubing contains a certain lustre of colours and exactness of imitation, which are so far beauties, and would affect the mind of a peasant or Indian with the highest admiration. The most vulgar ballads are not entirely destitute of harmony or nature; and none but a person familiarised to superior beauties would pronounce their numbers harsh, or narration uninteresting. A great inferiority of beauty gives pain to a person conversant in the highest excellence of the kind, and is for that reason pronounced a deformity: as the most finished object with which we are acquainted is naturally supposed to have reached the pinnacle of perfection, and to be entitled to the highest applause. One accustomed to see, and examine, and weigh the several performances, admired in different ages and nations, can alone rate the merits of a work exhibited to his view, and assign its proper rank among the productions of genius.

But to enable a critic the more fully to execute this undertaking, he must preserve his mind free from all *prejudice*, and allow nothing to enter into his consideration but the very object which is submitted to his examination. We may observe, that every work of art, in order to produce its due effect on the mind, must be surveyed in a certain point of view, and cannot be fully relished by persons, whose situation, real or imaginary, is not conformable to that which is required by the performance. An orator addresses himself to a particular audience, and must have a regard to their particular genius, interests, opinions, passions, and prejudices; otherwise he hopes in vain to govern their resolutions, and inflame their affections. Should they even have entertained some prepossessions against him, however unreasonable, he must not overlook this disadvantage; but, before he enters upon the subject, must endeavour to conciliate their affection, and acquire their good graces. A critic of a different age or nation, who should peruse this discourse, must have all these circumstances in his eye, and must place himself in the same situation as the audience, in order to form a true judgment of the oration. In like manner, when any work is addressed to the public, though I should have a friendship or enmity with the author, I must depart from this situation; and considering myself as a man in general, forget, if possible, my individual

being, and my peculiar circumstances A person influenced by prejudice, complies not with this condition, but obstinately maintains his natural position, without placing himself in that point of view which the performance supposes If the work be addressed to persons of a different age or nation, he makes no allowance for their peculiar views and prejudices, but, full of the manners of his own age and country, rashly condemns what seemed admirable in the eyes of those for whom alone the discourse was calculated If the work be executed for the public, he never sufficiently enlarges his comprehension, or forgets his interest as a friend or enemy, as a rival or commentator By this means, his sentiments are perverted, nor have the same beauties and blemishes the same influence upon him, as if he had imposed a proper violence on his imagination, and had forgotten himself for a moment So far his taste evidently departs from the true standard, and of consequence loses all credit and authority

It is well known, that in all questions submitted to the understanding, prejudice is destructive of sound judgment, and perverts all operations of the intellectual faculties it is no less contrary to good taste, nor has it less influence to corrupt our sentiment of beauty It belongs to *good sense* to check its influence in both cases, and in this respect, as well as in many others, reason, if not an essential part of taste is at least requisite to the operations of this latter faculty In all the nobler productions of genius, there is a mutual relation and correspondence of parts nor can either the beauties or blemishes be perceived by him, whose thought is not capacious enough to comprehend all those parts, and compare them with each other, in order to perceive the consistence and uniformity of the whole Every work of art has also a certain end or purpose for which it is calculated and is to be deemed more or less perfect, as it is more or less fitted to attain this end The object of eloquence is to persuade, of history to instruct of poetry to please, by means of the passions and the imagination These ends we must carry constantly in our view when we peruse any performance, and we must be able to judge how far the means employed are adapted to their respective purposes Besides, every kind of composition, even the most poetical, is nothing but a chain of propositions and reasonings, not always, indeed, the justest and most exact, but still plausible and specious, however disguised by the colouring of the imagination The persons introduced in tragedy and epic poetry, must be represented as reasoning, and thinking, and concluding, and acting, suitably to their character and circumstances, and without judgment, as well as taste and invention, a poet can never hope to succeed in so delicate an undertaking Not to mention, that the same excellence of faculties which contributes to the improvement of reason, the same clearness of conception, the same exactness of distinction, the same vivacity of apprehension, are essential to the operations of true taste, and are its

infallible concomitants. It seldom or never happens, that a man of sense, who has experience in any art, cannot judge of its beauty; and it is no less rare to meet with a man who has a just taste without a sound understanding.

Thus, though the principles of taste be universal, and nearly, if not entirely, the same in all men; yet few are qualified to give judgment on any work of art, or establish their own sentiment as the standard of beauty. The organs of internal sensation are seldom so perfect as to allow the general principles their full play, and produce a feeling correspondent to those principles. They either labour under some defect, or are vitiated by some disorder; and by that means, excite a sentiment, which may be pronounced erroneous. When the critic has no delicacy, he judges without any distinction, and is only affected by the grosser and more palpable qualities of the object: the finer touches pass unnoticed and disregarded. Where he is not aided by practice, his verdict is attended with confusion and hesitation. Where no comparison has been employed, the most frivolous beauties, such as rather merit the name of defects, are the object of his admiration. Where he lies under the influence of prejudice, all his natural sentiments are perverted. Where good sense is wanting, he is not qualified to discern the beauties of design and reasoning, which are the highest and most excellent. Under some or other of these imperfections, the generality of men labour; and hence a true judge in the finer arts is observed, even during the most polished ages, to be so rare a character: strong sense, united to delicate sentiment, improved by practice, perfected by comparison, and cleared of all prejudice, can alone entitle critics to this valuable character; and the joint verdict of such, wherever they are to be found, is the true standard of taste and of beauty.

But where are such critics to be found? By what marks are they to be known? How distinguish them from pretenders? These questions are embarrassing; and seem to throw us back into the same uncertainty, from which, during the course of this essay, we have endeavoured to extricate ourselves.

But if we consider the matter aright, these are questions of fact, not of sentiment. Whether any particular person be endowed with good sense and a delicate imagination, free from prejudice, may often be the subject of dispute, and be liable to great discussion and inquiry. But that such a character is valuable and estimable, will be agreed in by all mankind. Where these doubts occur, men can do no more than in other disputable questions which are submitted to the understanding: they must produce the best arguments that their invention suggests to them; they must acknowledge a true and decisive standard to exist somewhere, to wit, real existence and matter of fact; and they must have indulgence to such as differ from them in their appeals to

this standard. It is sufficient for our present purpose, if we have proved, that the taste of all individuals is not upon an equal footing, and that some men in general, however difficult to be particularly pitched upon, will be acknowledged by universal sentiment to have a preference above others

But in reality, the difficulty of finding, even in particulars, the standard of taste, is not so great as it is represented Though in speculation, we may readily avow a certain criterion in science, and deny it in sentiment, the matter is found in practice to be much more hard to ascertain in the former case than in the latter Theories of abstract philosophy, systems of profound theology, have prevailed during one age in a successive period, these have been universally exploded their absurdity has been detected other theories and systems have supplied their place which again gave place to their successors and nothing has been experienced more liable to the revolutions of chance and fashion than these pretended decisions of science The case is not the same with the beauties of eloquence and poetry Just expressions of passion and nature are sure, after a little time, to gain public applause, which they maintain for ever Aristotle, and Plato, and Epicurus, and Descartes, may successively yield to each other but Terence and Virgil maintain an universal, undisputed empire over the minds of men The abstract philosophy of Cicero has lost its credit the vehemence of his oratory is still the object of our admiration

Though men of delicate taste be rare, they are easily to be distinguished in society by the soundness of their understanding, and the superiority of their faculties above the rest of mankind The ascendant, which they acquire, gives a prevalence to that lively approbation, with which they receive any productions of genius, and renders it generally predominant. Many men, when left to themselves, have but a faint and dubious perception of beauty, who yet are capable of relishing any fine stroke which is pointed out to them Every convert to the admiration of the real poet or orator is the cause of some new conversion And though prejudices may prevail for a time, they never unite in celebrating any rival to the true genius, but yield at last to the force of nature and just sentiment Thus, though a civilized nation may easily be mistaken in the choice of their admired philosopher, they never have been found long to err, in their affection for a favourite epic or tragic author

But notwithstanding all our endeavours to fix a standard of taste, and reconcile the discordant apprehensions of men, there still remain two sources of variation, which are not sufficient indeed to confound all the boundaries of beauty and deformity, but will often serve to produce a difference in the degrees of our approbation or blame. The one is the different humours of particular men, the other, the parti-

cular manners and opinions of our age and country. The general principles of taste are uniform in human nature where men vary in there judgments, some defect or perversions in the faculties may commonly be remarked; proceeding either from prejudice, from want of practice, or want of delicacy and there is just reason for approving one taste, and condemning another But where there is such a diversity in the internal frame or external situation as is entirely blameless on both sides, and leaves no room to give one the preference above the other, in that case a certain degree of diversity in judgment is unavoidable, and we seek in vain for a standard, by which we can reconcile the contrary sentiments

A young man, whose passions are warm, will be more sensibly touched with amorous and tender images, than a man more advanced in years, who takes pleasure in wise, philosophical reflections, concerning the conduct of life and moderation of the passions At twenty, Ovid may be the favourite author, Horace at forty, and perhaps Tacitus at fifty Vainly would we, in such cases, endeavour to enter into the sentiments of others, and divest ourselves of those propensities which are natural to us We choose our favourite author as we do our friend, from a conformity of humour and disposition Mirth or passion, sentiment or reflection, which ever of these most predominates in our temper, it gives us a peculiar sympathy with the writer who resembles us

One person is more pleased with the sublime another with the tender, a third with raillery One has a strong sensibility to blemishes, and is extremely studious of correctness another has a more lively feeling of beauties, and pardons twenty absurdities and defects for one elevated or pathetic stroke The ear of this man is entirely turned towards conciseness and energy, that man is delighted with a copious, rich, and harmonious expression Simplicity is affected by one, ornament by another Comedy, tragedy, satire, odes, have each its partizans, who prefer that particular species of writing to all others It is plainly an error in a critic, to confine his approbation to one species or style of writing, and condemn all the rest But it is almost impossible not to feel a predilection for that which suits our particular turn and disposition Such preferences are innocent and unavoidable, and can never reasonably be the object of dispute, because there is no standard by which they can be decided

For a like reason, we are more pleased, in the course of our reading, with pictures and characters that resemble objects which are found in our own age or country, than with those which describe a different set of customs. It is not without some effort, that we reconcile ourselves to the simplicity of ancient manners, and behold princesses carrying water from the spring, and kings and heroes dressing their own victuals. We may allow in general, that the representation of such manners is

no fault in the author, nor deformity in the piece, but we are not so sensibly touched with them. For this reason, comedy is not easily transferred from one age or nation to another A Frenchman or Englishman is not pleased with the *Andria* of Terence, or *Clitia* of Machiavel, where the fine lady, upon whom all the play turns, never once appears to the spectators, but is always kept behind the scenes, suitably to the reserved humour of the ancient Greeks and modern Italians. A man of learning and reflection can make allowance for these peculiarities of manners, but a common audience can never divest themselves so far of their usual ideas and sentiments, as to relish pictures which nowise resemble them

But here there occurs a reflection, which may, perhaps, be useful in examining the celebrated controversy concerning ancient and modern learning, where we often find the one side excusing any seeming absurdity in the ancients from the manners of the age, and the other refusing to admit this excuse, or at least admitting it only as an apology for the author, not for the performance. In my opinion, the proper boundaries in this object have seldom been fixed between the contending parties Where any innocent peculiarities of manners are represented, such as those above mentioned, they ought certainly to be admitted, and a man, who is shocked with them, gives an evident proof of false delicacy and refinement The poet's *monument more durable than brass*, must fall to the ground like common brick or clay, were men to make no allowance for the continual revolutions of manners and customs, and would admit of nothing but what was suitable to the prevailing fashion Must we throw aside the pictures of our ancestors, because of their ruffs and fardingales? But where the ideas of morality and decency alter from one age to another, and where vicious manners are described, without being marked with the proper characters of blame and disapprobation, this must be allowed to disfigure the poem, and to be a real deformity I cannot, nor is it proper I should, enter into such sentiments, and however I may excuse the poet, on account of the manners of his age I never can relish the composition The want of humanity and of decency, so conspicuous in the characters drawn by several of the ancient poets, even sometimes by Homer and the Greek tragedians, diminishes considerably the merit of their noble performances, and gives modern authors an advantage over them We are not interested in the fortunes and sentiments of such rough heroes we are displeased to find the limits of vice and virtue so much confounded, and whatever indulgence we may give to the writer on account of his prejudices, we cannot prevail on ourselves to enter into his sentiments, or bear an affection to characters, which we plainly discover to be blameable.

The case is not the same with moral principles as with speculative

opinions of any kind These are in continual flux and revolution The son embraces a different system from the father Nay, there scarcely is any man, who can boast of great constancy and uniformity in this particular Whatever speculative errors may be found in the polite writings of any age or country, they detract but little from the value of those compositions There needs but a certain turn of thought or imagination to make us enter into all the opinions, which then prevailed, and relish the sentiments or conclusions derived from them But a very violent effort is requisite to change our judgment of manners, and excite sentiments of approbation or blame, love or hatred, different from those to which the mind, from long custom, has been familiarized And where a man is confident of the rectitude of that moral standard, by which he judges, he is justly jealous of it, and will not pervert the sentiments of his heart for a moment in complaisance to any writer whatsoever

Of all the speculative errors, those which regard religion are the most excusable in composition of genius, nor it is ever permitted to judge of the civility or wisdom of any people, or even of single persons, by the grossness or refinement of their theological principles. On this account, all the absurdities of the pagan system of theology must be overlooked by every critic, who would pretend to form a just notion of ancient poetry, and our posterity, in their turn, must have the same indulgence to their forefathers No religious principles can ever be imputed as a fault to any poet, while they remain merely principles, and take not such strong possession of his heart, as to lay him under the imputation of *bigotry* or *superstition* Where that happens, they confound the sentiments of morality, and alter the natural boundaries of vice and virtue They are therefore eternal blemishes, according to the principles above mentioned, nor are the prejudices and false opinions of the age sufficient to justify them

It is essential to the Roman Catholic religion to inspire a violent hatred of every other worship, and to represent all pagans, mahometans, and heretics, as the objects of Divine wrath and vengeance Such sentiments, though they are in reality very blameable, are considered as virtues by the zealots of that communion, and are represented in their tragedies and epic poems as a kind of divine heroism. This bigotry has disfigured two very fine tragedies of the French theatre, POLIEUCTE and ATHALIA, where an intemperate zeal for particular modes of worship is set off with all the pomp imaginable, and forms the predominant character of the heroes 'What is this,' says the sublime JOAD to JOSABET, finding her in discourse with MATHAM the priest of BAAL, 'Does the daughter of DAVID speak to this traitor? Are you not afraid, less the earth should open and pour forth flames to devour you both? Or lest these holy walls should fall and crush you together? What is his purpose? Why comes that

enemy of GOD hither to poison the air, which we breathe, with his horrid presence?' Such sentiments are received with great applause on the theatre of Paris, but at London the spectators would be full as much pleased to hear Achilles tell Agamemnon, that he was a dog in his forehead, and a deer in his heart, or Jupiter threaten Juno with a sound drubbing, if she will be not quiet.

XXIII.—OF COMMERCE.

THE greater part of mankind may be divided into two classes, that of *shallow* thinkers, who fall short of the truth, and that of *abstruse* thinkers, who go beyond it. The latter class are by far the most rare, and, I may add, by far the most useful and valuable. They suggest hints, at least, and start difficulties, which they want, perhaps, skill to pursue; but which may produce fine discoveries, when handled by men who have a more just way of thinking. At worst, what they say is uncommon, and if it should cost some pains to comprehend it, one has, however the pleasure of hearing something that is new. An author is little to be valued who tells us nothing but what we can learn from every coffee-house conversation.

All people of *shallow* thought are apt to decry even those of *solid* understanding, as *abstruse* thinkers, and metaphysicians, and refiners, and never will allow any thing to be just which is beyond their own weak conceptions. There are some cases I own, where an extraordinary refinement affords a strong presumption of falsehood, and where no reasoning is to be trusted but what is natural and easy. When a man deliberates concerning his conduct in any *particular* affair, and forms schemes in politics, trade, economy, or any business in life, he never ought to draw his arguments too fine, or connect too long a chain of consequences together. Something is sure to happen, that will disconcert his reasoning, and produce an event different from what he expected. But when we reason upon *general* subjects, one may justly affirm, that our speculations can scarcely ever be too fine, provided they be just, and that the difference between a common man and a man of genius is chiefly seen in the shallowness or depth of the principles upon which they proceed. General reasonings seem intricate, merely because they are general, nor is it easy for the bulk of mankind to distinguish in a great number of particulars, that common circumstance in which they all agree, or to extract it, pure and unmixed, from the other superfluous circumstances. Every judgment or con-

clusion, with them, as particular. They cannot enlarge their view to those universal propositions, which comprehend under them an infinite number of individuals, and include a whole science in a single theorem. Their eye is confounded with such an extensive prospect; and the conclusions derived from it, even though clearly expressed, seem intricate and obscure. But however intricate they may seem, it is certain, that general principles, if just and sound, must always prevail in the general course of things, though they may fail in particular cases; and it is the chief business of philosophers to regard the general course of things. I may add, that it is also the chief business of politicians; especially in the domestic government of the state, where the public good, which is, or ought to be their object, depends on the concurrence of a multitude of causes; not, as in foreign politics, on accidents and chances, and the caprices of a few persons. This therefore makes the difference between *particular* deliberations and *general* reasonings, and renders subtilty and refinement much more suitable to the latter than to the former.

I thought this introduction necessary before the following discourses on *commerce*, *money*, *interest*, *balance of trade*, &c. where, perhaps, there will occur some principles which are uncommon, and which may seem too refined and subtile for such vulgar subjects. If false, let them be rejected: but no one ought to entertain a prejudice against them, merely because they are out of the common road.

The greatness of a state, and the happiness of its subjects, how independent soever they may be supposed in some respects, are commonly allowed to be inseparable with regard to commerce; and as private men receive greater security, in the possession of their trade and riches, from the power of the public, so the public becomes powerful in proportion to the opulence and extensive commerce of private men. This maxim is true in general; though I cannot forbear thinking that it may possibly admit of exceptions, and that we often establish it with too little reserve and limitation. There may be some circumstances, where the commerce, and riches, and luxury of individuals, instead of adding strength to the public, will serve only to thin its armies, and diminish its authority among the neighbouring nations. Man is a very variable being, and susceptible of many different opinions, principles, and rules of conduct. What may be true, while he adheres to one way of thinking, will be found false, when he has embraced an opposite set of manners and opinions.

The bulk of every state may be divided into *husbandmen* and *manufacturers*. The former are employed in the culture of the land; the latter works up the materials furnished by the former into all the commodities which are necessary or ornamental to human life. As soon as men quit their savage state, where they live chiefly by hunting and fishing, they must fall into these two classes; though the arts of agri-

culture employ *at first* the most numerous part of the society*. Time and experience improve so much these arts, that the land may easily maintain a much greater number of men than those who are immediately employed in its culture, or who furnish the more necessary manufactures to such as are so employed.

If these superfluous hands apply themselves to the finer arts, which are commonly denominated the arts of *luxury*, they add to the happiness of the state; since they afford to many the opportunity of receiving enjoyments, with which they otherwise have been unacquainted. But may not another scheme be proposed for the employment of these superfluous hands? May not the sovereign lay claim to them, and employ them in fleets and armies, to increase the dominion of the state abroad, and spread its fame over distant nations? It is certain, that the fewer desires and wants are found in the proprietors and labourers of land, the fewer hands do they employ; and consequently, the superfluities of the land, instead of maintaining tradesmen and manufacturers, may support fleets and armies to a much greater extent, than where a great many arts are required to minister to the luxury of particular persons. Here therefore seems to be a kind of opposition between the greatness of the state and the happiness of the subject. A state is never greater than when all its superfluous hands are employed in the service of the public. The ease and convenience of private persons require, that these hands should be employed in their service. The one can never be satisfied but at the expense of the other. As the ambition of the sovereign must entrench on the luxury of individuals; so the luxury of individuals must diminish the force, and check the ambition, of the sovereign.

Nor is this reasoning merely chimerical; but is founded on history and experience. The republic of Sparta was certainly more powerful than any state now in the world, consisting of an equal number of people; and this was owing entirely to the want of commerce and luxury. The Helotes were the labourers, the Spartans were the soldiers or gentlemen. It is evident, that the labour of the Helotes could not have maintained so great a number of Spartans, had these latter lived in ease and delicacy, and given employment to a great variety of trades and manufactures. The like policy may be remarked in Rome. And, indeed, throughout all ancient history, it is observable, that the smallest republics raised and maintained greater armies, than states, consisting of triple the number of inhabitants, are able to support at present. It is computed, that in all European nations, the pro-

* Mons. Melon, in his political essay on commerce, asserts, that even at present, if you divide France into twenty parts, sixteen are labourers or peasants; two only artizans; one belonging to the law, church, and military; and one merchants, financiers, and bourgeois. This calculation is certainly very erroneous. In France, England, and indeed most parts of Europe, half of the inhabitants live in cities; and even of those who live in the country, a great number are artizans, perhaps above a third.

portion between soldiers and people does not exceed one to a hundred. But we read, that the city of Rome alone, with its small territory, raised and maintained, in early times, ten legions against the Latins. Athens, the whole of whose dominions was not larger than Yorkshire sent to the expedition against Sicily near 40,000 men. [THUCYDIDES, lib. vii.] Dionysius the elder, it is said, maintained a standing army of 100,000 foot, and 10,000 horse, besides a large fleet of 400 sail;* though his territories extended no farther than the city of Syracuse, about a third of the island of Sicily, and some sea-port towns and garrisons on the coast of Italy and Illyricum. It is true, the ancient armies, in time of war, subsisted much upon plunder: but did not the enemy plunder in their turn? which was a more ruinous way of levying a tax, than any other that could be devised. In short, no probable reason can be assigned for the great power of the more ancient states above the modern, but their want of commerce and luxury. Few artizans were maintained by the labour of the farmers, and therefore more soldiers might live upon it. Livy says, that Rome, in his time, would find it difficult to raise as large an army as that which, in her early days, she sent out against the Gauls and Latins.† Instead of those soldiers who fought for liberty and empire in Camillus's time, there were, in Augustus's days, musicians, painters, cooks, players, and tailors; and if the land was equally cultivated at both periods, it could certainly maintain equal numbers in the one profession as in the other. They added nothing to the mere necessaries of life, in the latter period more than in the former.

It is natural on this occasion to ask, whether sovereigns may not return to the maxims of ancient policy, and consult their own interest in this respect, more than the happiness of their subjects? I answer, that it appears to me almost impossible; and that because ancient policy was violent, and contrary to the more natural and usual course of things. It is well known with what peculiar laws Sparta was governed, and what a prodigy that republic is justly esteemed by every one, who has considered human nature, as it has displayed itself in other nations, and other ages. Were the testimony of history less positive and circumstantial, such a government would appear a mere philosophical whim or fiction, and impossible ever to be reduced to practice. And though the Roman and other ancient republics were supported on principles somewhat more natural, yet was there an extraordinary concurrence of circumstances to make them submit to such grievous burthens. They were free states; they were small ones; and the age being martial, all their neighbours were continually in arms. Freedom naturally begets public spirit, especially in small states; and

* DIOD. SIC. lib. vii. This account, I own, is somewhat suspicious, not to say worse; chiefly because this army was not composed of citizens, but of mercenary forces.

† TITI LIVII, lib. vii. cap. 24. 'Adeo in quae laboramus,' says he, 'sola crevimus, divitias luxuriamque.'

this public spirit, this *amor patriæ*, must increase, when the public is almost in continual alarm, and men are obliged, every moment, to expose themselves to the greatest dangers for its defence. A continual succession of wars makes every citizen a soldier: he takes the field in his turn: and during his service he is chiefly maintained by himself. This service is indeed equivalent to a heavy tax; yet is it less felt by a people addicted to arms, who fight for honour and revenge more than pay, and are unacquainted with gain and industry, as well as pleasure.* Not to mention the great equality of fortunes among the inhabitants of the ancient republics, where every field, belonging to a different proprietor, was able to maintain a family, and rendered the number of citizens very considerable, even without trade and without manufactures.

But though the want of trade and manufactures, among a free and very martial people, may sometimes have no other effect than to render the public more powerful; it is certain, that, in the common course of human affairs, it will have a quite contrary tendency. Sovereigns must take mankind as they find them, and cannot pretend to introduce any violent change in their principles and ways of thinking. A long course of time, with a variety of accidents and circumstances, are requisite to produce those great revolutions, which so much diversify the face of human affairs. And the less natural any set of principles are, which support a particular society, the more difficulty will a legislator meet with in raising and cultivating them. It is his best policy to comply with the common bent of mankind, and give it all the improvements of which it is susceptible. Now, according to the most natural course of things, industry, and arts, and trade, increase the power of the sovereign, as well as the happiness of the subjects; and that policy is violent which aggrandizes the public by the poverty of individuals. This will easily appear from a few considerations, which will present to us the consequences of sloth and barbarity.

Where manufactures and mechanic arts are not cultivated, the bulk of the people must apply themselves to agriculture; and if their skill and industry increase, there must arise a great superfluity from their labour, beyond what suffices to maintain them. They have no temptation, therefore, to increase their skill and industry; since they cannot

*The more ancient Romans lived in perpetual war with all their neighbours: and in old Latin, the term *hostis*, expressed both a stranger and an enemy. This is remarked by Cicero; but by him is ascribed to the humanity of his ancestors, who softened as much as possible, the denomination of an enemy, by calling him by the same appellation which signified a stranger. *De Off. lib. ii.* It is however much more probable from the manners of the times, that the ferocity of those people was so great as to make them regard all strangers as enemies, and call them by the same name. It is not besides consistent with the most common maxims of policy or of nature, that any state should regard its public enemies with a friendly eye, or preserve any such sentiments for them as the Roman orator would ascribe to his ancestors. Not to mention, that the early Romans really exercised piracy, as we learn from their first treaties with Carthage, preserved by *Polybius*, lib. iii. and consequently like the Sallee and Algerine rovers, were actually at war with most nations, and a stranger and an enemy were with them almost synonymous.

exchange that superfluity for any commodities, which may serve either to their pleasure or vanity. A habit of indolence naturally prevails. The greater part of the land lies uncultivated. What is cultivated, yields not its utmost for want of skill and assiduity in the farmers. If at any time the public exigencies require that great numbers should be employed in the public service, the labour of the people furnishes now no superfluities, by which these numbers can be maintained. The labourers cannot increase their skill and industry on a sudden. Lands uncultivated cannot be brought into tillage for some years. The armies, meanwhile, must either make sudden and violent conquests, or disband for want of subsistence. A regular attack or defence, therefore, is not to be expected from such a people, and their soldiers must be as ignorant and unskilful as their farmers and their manufacturers.

Every thing in the world is purchased by labour; and our passions are the only causes of labour. When a nation abounds in manufactures and mechanic arts, the proprietors of land, as well as the farmers, study agriculture as a science, and redouble their industry and attention. The superfluity, which arises from their labour, is not lost but is exchanged with manufactures for those commodities which men's luxury now makes them covet. By this means, land furnishes a great deal more of the necessaries of life, than what suffices for those who cultivate it. In times of peace and tranquillity, this superfluity goes to the maintenance of manufactures and the improvers of liberal arts. But it is easy for the public to convert many of these manufacturers into soldiers, and maintain them by that superfluity which arises from the labour of the farmers. Accordingly we find, that this is the case in all civilized governments. When the sovereign raises an army, what is the consequence? He imposes a tax. This tax obliges all the people to retrench what is least necessary to their subsistence. Those who labour in such commodities must either enlist in the troops, or turn themselves to agriculture, and thereby oblige some labourers to enlist for want of business. And to consider the matter abstractedly, manufactures increase the power of the state only as they store up so much labour, and that of a kind to which the public may lay claim, without depriving any one of the necessaries of life. The more labour, therefore, is employed beyond mere necessaries, the more powerful is any state; since the persons engaged in that labour may easily be converted to the public service. In a state without manufactures, there may be the same number of hands; but there is not the same quantity of labour, nor of the same kind. All the labour is there bestowed upon necessaries, which can admit of little or no abatement.

Thus the greatness of the sovereign, and the happiness of the state, are in a great measure united, with regard to trade and manufactures.

It is a violent method, and in most cases impracticable, to oblige the labourer to toil, in order to raise from the land more than what subsists himself and family. Furnish him with manufactures and commodities, and he will do it of himself. Afterwards you will find it easy to seize some part of his superfluous labour, and employ it in the public service, without giving him his wonted return. Being accustomed to industry, he will think this less grievous, than if, at once, you obliged him to an augmentation of labour without any reward. The case is the same with regard to the other members of the state. The greater is the stock of labour of all kinds, the greater quantity may be taken from the heap, without making any sensible alteration in it.

A public granary of corn, a storehouse of cloth, a magazine of arms, all these must be allowed real riches and strength in any state. Trade and industry are really nothing but a stock of labour, which, in times of peace and tranquillity, is employed for the ease and satisfaction of individuals, but, in the exigencies of state may in part be turned to public advantage. Could we convert a city into a kind of fortified camp, and infuse into each breast so martial a genius, and such a passion for public good, as to make every one willing to undergo the greatest hardships for the sake of the public, these affections might now, as in ancient times, prove alone a sufficient spur to industry, and support the community. It would then be advantageous, as in camps, to banish all arts and luxury, and, by restrictions on equipage and tables, make the provisions and forage last longer than if the army were loaded with a number of superfluous retainers. But as these principles are too disinterested, and too difficult to support it is requisite to govern men by other passions, and animate them with a spirit of avarice and industry, art and luxury. The camp is, in this case, loaded with a superfluous retinue, but the provisions flow in proportionably larger. The harmony of the whole is still supported, and the natural bent of the mind, being more complied with, individuals, as well as the public, find their account in the observance of these maxims.

The same method of reasoning will let us see the advantage of *foreign* commerce, in augmenting the power of the state, as well as the riches and happiness of the subject. It increases the stock of labour in the nation, and the sovereign may convert what share of it he finds necessary to the service of the public. Foreign trade, by its imports, furnishes materials for new manufactures, and, by its exports, it produces labour in particular commodities, which could not be consumed at home. In short, a kingdom that has a large import and export, must abound more with industry, and that employed upon delicacies and luxuries, than a kingdom which rests contented with its native commodities. It is, therefore, more powerful, as well as richer and happier. The individuals reap the benefit of these com-

modities, so far as they gratify the senses and appetites And the public is also a gainer, while a greater stock of labour is, by this means, stored up against any public exigency that is, a greater number of laborious men are maintained, who may be diverted to the public service, without robbing any one of the necessaries, or even the chief conveniences of life

If we consult history, we shall find, that, in most nations, foreign trade has preceded any refinement in home manufactures, and given birth to luxury The temptation is stronger to make use of foreign commodities, which are ready for use, and which are entirely new to us, than to make improvements on any domestic commodity, which always advance by slow degrees, and never affect us by their novelty The profit is also very great, in exporting what is superfluous at home, and what bears no price, to foreign nations, whose soil or climate is not favourable to that commodity Thus men become acquainted with the *pleasures* of luxury, and the *profits* of commerce, and their *delicacy* and *industry*, being once awakened, carry them on to further improvements in every branch of domestic as well as foreign trade And this perhaps is the chief advantage which arises from a commerce with strangers It rouses men from their indolence, and presenting the gayer and more opulent part of the nation with objects of luxury which they never before dreamed of, raises in them a desire of a more splendid way of life than what their ancestors enjoyed And, at the same time, the few merchants who possess the secret of this importation and exportation, make great profits, and, becoming rivals in wealth to the ancient nobility, tempt other adventurers to become their rivals in commerce. Imitation soon diffuses all those arts, while domestic manufactures emulate the foreign in their improvements, and work up every home commodity to the utmost perfection of which it is susceptible Their own steel and iron, in such laborious hands, become equal to the gold and rubies of the Indies

When the affairs of the society are once brought to this situation, a nation may lose most of its foreign trade, and yet continue a great and powerful people If strangers will not take any particular commodity of ours, we must cease to labour in it The same hands will turn themselves towards some refinement in other commodities, which may be wanted at home And there must always be materials for them to work upon, till every person in the state, who possesses riches, enjoys as great plenty of home commodities, and those in as great perfection, as he desires which can never possibly happen China is represented as one of the most flourishing empires in the world, though it has very little commerce beyond its own territories.

It will not, I hope, be considered as a superfluous digression, if I here observe, that, as the multitude of mechanical arts is advantageous,

so is the great number of persons to whose share the productions of these arts fall. A too great disproportion among the citizens weakens any state. Every person, if possible, ought to enjoy the fruits of his labour, in a full possession of all the necessaries, and many of the conveniences of life. No one can doubt but such an equality is most suitable to human nature, and diminishes much less from the *happiness* of the rich, than it adds to that of the poor. It also augments the *power of the state*, and makes any extraordinary taxes or impositions be paid with more cheerfulness. Where the riches are engrossed by a few, these must contribute very largely to the supplying of the public necessities. But when the riches are dispersed among multitudes, the burthen feels light on every shoulder, and the taxes make not a very sensible difference on any one's way of living.

Add to this, that, where the riches are in few hands, these must enjoy all the power, and will readily conspire to lay the whole burthen on the poor, and oppress them still farther, to the discouragement of all industry.

In this circumstance consists the great advantage of England above any nation at present in the world, or that appears in the records of any story. It is true, the English feel some disadvantages in foreign trade by the high price of labour, which is in part the effect of the riches of their artizans, as well as of the plenty of money: but as foreign trade is not the most material circumstance, it is not to be put in competition with the happiness of so many millions. And if there were no more to endear to them that free government under which they live, this alone were sufficient. The poverty of the common people is a natural, if not an infallible effect of absolute monarchy; though I doubt, whether it be always true, on the other hand, that their riches are an infallible result of liberty. Liberty must be attended with particular accidents, and a certain turn of thinking, in order to produce that effect. Lord Bacon, accounting for the great advantages obtained by the English in their wars with France, ascribes them chiefly to the superior ease and plenty of the common people amongst the former; yet the government of the two kingdoms was, at that time, pretty much alike. Where the labourers and artizans are accustomed to work for low wages, and to retain but a small part of the fruits of their labour, it is difficult for them, even in a free government, to better their condition, or conspire among themselves to heighten their wages. But even where they are accustomed to a more plentiful way of life, it is easy for the rich, in an arbitrary government, to conspire against *them*, and throw the whole burthen of the taxes on their shoulders.

It may seem an odd position that the poverty of the common people in France, Italy, and Spain, is, in some measure, owing to the superior riches of the soil and happiness of the climate; yet there want not reasons to justify this paradox. In such a fine mould or soil as that

of those more southern regions, agriculture is an easy art; and one man, with a couple of sorry horses, will be able, in a season, to cultivate as much land as will pay a pretty considerable rent to the proprietor All the art, which the farmer knows, is to leave his ground fallow for a year, as soon as it is exhausted, and the warmth of the sun alone and temperature of the climate enrich it, and restore its fertility Such poor peasants, therefore, require only a simple maintenance for their labour They have no stock or riches, which claim more, and at the same time they are for ever dependent on the landlord, who give no leases, nor fears that his land will be spoiled by the ill methods of cultivation In England, the land is rich, but coarse, must be cultivated at a great expense, and produces slender crops, when not carefully managed, and by a method which gives not the full profit but in a course of several years A farmer, therefore, in England must have a considerable stock, and a long lease, which beget proportional profits The vineyards of Champagne and Burgundy, that often yield to the landlord above five pounds per acre, are cultivated by peasants, who have scarcely bread the reason is, that such peasants need no stock but their own limbs, with instruments of husbandry, which they can buy for twenty shillings. The farmers are commonly in some better circumstances in those countries. But the graziers are most at their ease of all those who cultivate the land The reason is still the same Men must have profits proportionable to their expense and hazard Where so considerable a number of the labouring poor, as the peasants and farmers, are in very low circumstances, all the rest must partake of their poverty, whether the government of that nation be monarchical or republican

We may form a similar remark with regard to the general history of mankind What is the reason, why no people, living between the tropics, could ever yet attain to any art or civility, or reach even any police in their government, and any military discipline, while few nations in the temperate climates have been altogether deprived of these advantages? It is probable that one cause of this phenomenon is the warmth and equality of weather in the torrid zone, which render clothes and houses less requisite for the inhabitants, and thereby remove, in part, that necessity, which is the great spur to industry and invention. *Curis acuens mortalia corda* Not to mention, that the fewer goods or possessions of this kind any people enjoy, the fewer quarrels are likely to arise amongst them, and the less necessity will there be for a settled police or regular authority, to protect and defend them from foreign enemies, or from each other.

XXIV.—OF REFINEMENT IN THE ARTS.

LUXURY is a word of an uncertain signification, and may be taken in a good as well as in a bad sense. In general, it means great refinement in the gratification of the senses; and any degree of it may be innocent or blameable, according to the age, or country, or condition of the person. The bounds between the virtue and the vice cannot here be exactly fixed, more than in other moral subjects. To imagine, that the gratifying of any sense, or the indulging of any delicacy in meat, drink, or apparel, is of itself a vice, can never enter into a head, that is not disordered by the frenzies of enthusiasm. I have, indeed, heard of a monk abroad, who, because the windows of his cell opened upon a noble prospect, made a *covenant with his eyes* never to turn that way, or receive so sensual a gratification. And such is the crime of drinking Champagne or Burgundy, preferable to small beer or porter. These indulgences are only vices, when they are pursued at the expence of some virtue, as liberality or charity; in like manner as they are follies, when for them a man ruins his fortune, and reduces himself to want and beggary. Where they entrench upon no virtue, but leave ample subject whence to provide for friends, family, and every proper object of generosity or compassion, they are entirely innocent, and have in every age been acknowledged such by almost all moralists. To be entirely occupied with the luxury of the table, for instance, without any relish for the pleasures of ambition, study, or conversation, is a mark of stupidity, and is incompatible with any vigour of temper or genius. To confine one's expense entirely to such a gratification, without regard to friends or family, is an indication of a heart destitute of humanity or benevolence. But if a man reserve time sufficient for all laudable pursuits, and money sufficient for all generous purposes, he is free from every shadow of blame or reproach.

Since luxury may be considered either as innocent or blameable, one may be surprised at those preposterous opinions, which have been entertained concerning it; while men of libertine principles bestow praises even on vicious luxury, and represent it as highly advantageous to society; and on the other hand, men of severe morals blame even the most innocent luxury, and represent it as the source of all the corruptions, disorders, and factions, incident to civil government. We shall here endeavour to correct both these extremes, by proving, I., that the ages of refinement are both the happiest and most virtuous; II. that wherever luxury ceases to be innocent, it also ceases to be beneficial; and when carried a degree too far, is a quality pernicious, though perhaps not the most pernicious, to political society.

To prove the first point, we need but consider the effects of refinement both on *private* and on *public* life Human happiness, according to the most received notions, seems to consist in three ingredients, action, pleasure, and indolence and though these ingredients ought to be mixed in different proportions, according to the particular disposition of the person, yet no one ingredient can be entirely wanting, without destroying, in some measure, the relish of the whole composition Indolence or repose, indeed, seems not of itself to contribute much to our enjoyment, but, like sleep, is requisite as an indulgence to the weakness of human nature, which cannot support an uninterrupted course of business or pleasure That quick march of the spirits, which takes a man from himself, and chiefly gives satisfaction, does in the end exhaust the mind, and requires some intervals of repose, which, though agreeable for a moment, yet, if prolonged, beget a languor and lethargy, that destroy all enjoyment Education, custom, and example, have a mighty influence in turning the mind to any of these pursuits, and it must be owned that, where they promote a relish for action and pleasure, they are so far favourable to human happiness In times when industry and the arts flourish, men are kept in perpetual occupation, and enjoy, as their reward, the occupation itself, as well as those pleasures which are the fruit of their labour The mind acquires new vigour, enlarges its powers and faculties, and, by an assiduity in honest industry, both satisfies its natural appetites, and prevents the growth of unnatural ones, which commonly spring up, when nourished by ease and idleness Banish those arts from society, you deprive men both of action and of pleasure, and leaving nothing but indolence in their place, you even destroy the relish of indolence, which never is agreeable, but when it succeeds to labour, and recruits the spirits, exhausted by too much application and fatigue

Another advantage of industry and of refinements in the mechanical arts, is, that they commonly produce some refinements in the liberal, nor can one be carried to perfection without being accompanied, in some degree, with the other The same age which produces great philosophers and politicians, renowned generals and poets, usually abounds with skilful weavers and ship-carpenters. We cannot reasonably expect, that a piece of woollen cloth will be wrought to perfection in a nation which is ignorant of astronomy, or where ethics are neglected. The spirit of the age affects all the arts, and the minds of men being once roused from their lethargy, and put into a fermentation, turn themselves on all sides, and carry improvements into every art and science Profound ignorance is totally banished, and men enjoy the privilege of rational creatures, to think as well as to act, to cultivate the pleasures of the mind as well as those of the body.

The more these refined arts advance, the more sociable men become

nor is it possible, that when enriched with science, and possessed of a fund of conversation, they should be contented to remain in solitude, or live with their fellow-citizens in that distant manner, which is peculiar to ignorant and barbarous nations They flock into cities, love to receive and communicate knowledge, to shew their wit or their breeding, their taste in conversation or living, in clothes or furniture Curiosity allures the wise, vanity the foolish, and pleasure both Particular clubs and societies are everywhere formed both sexes meet in an easy and sociable manner, and the tempers of men, as well as their behaviour, refine apace So that, besides the improvements which they receive from knowledge and the liberal arts, it is impossible but they must feel an increase of humanity, from the very habit of conversing together, and contributing to each other's pleasure and entertainment. Thus *industry*, *knowledge*, and *humanity*, are linked together by an indissoluble chain, and are found, from experience as well as reason, to be peculiar to the more polished, and, what are commonly denominated, the more luxurious ages

Nor are these advantages attended with disadvantages that bear any proportion to them The more men refine upon pleasure, the less will they indulge in excesses of any kind, because nothing is more destructive to true pleasure than such excesses One may safely affirm, that the Tartars are oftener guilty of beastly gluttony, when they feast on their dead horses, than European courtiers with all their refinements of cookery And if libertine love, or even infidelity to the marriage-bed, be more frequent in polite ages, when it is often regarded only as a piece of gallantry, drunkenness, on the other hand, is much less common a vice more odious, and more pernicious, both to mind and body And in this matter I would appeal, not only to an Ovid or a Petronius, but to a Seneca or a Cato We know, that Cæsar, during Catiline's conspiracy, being necessitated to put into Cato's hands a *billet-doux*, which discovered an intrigue with Servilia, Cato's own sister, that stern philosopher threw it back to him with indignation, and, in the bitterness of his wrath, gave him the appellation of drunkard, as a term more opprobrious than that with which he could more justly have reproached him

But industry, knowledge, and humanity, are not advantageous in private life alone, they diffuse their beneficial influence on the *public*, and render the government as great and flourishing as they make individuals happy and prosperous. The increase and consumption of all the commodities, which serve to the ornament and pleasure of life, are advantages to society, because, at the same time that they multiply those innocent gratifications to individuals, they are a kind of storehouse of labour, which, in the exigencies of the state, may be turned to the public service. In a nation, where there is no demand for such superfluities, men sink into indolence, lose all enjoyment of life, and

are useless to the public, which cannot maintain or support its fleets and armies from the industry of such slothful members.

The bounds of all the European kingdoms are, at present, nearly the same they were two hundred years ago but what a difference is there in the power and grandeur of those kingdoms? which can be ascribed to nothing but the increase of art and industry When Charles VIII of France invaded Italy, he carried with him about 20,000 men, yet this armament so exhausted the nation, as we learn from Guicciardin, that for some years it was not able to make so great an effort The late king of France, in time of war, kept in pay above 400,000 men*, though from Mazarine's death to his own, he was engaged in a course of wars that lasted near thirty years

This industry is much promoted by the knowledge inseparable from ages of art and refinement, as, on the other hand, this knowledge enables the public to make the best advantage of the industry of its subjects Laws, order, police, discipline, these can never be carried to any degree of perfection, before human reason has refined itself by exercise, and by an application to the more vulgar arts, at least, of commerce and manufacture Can we expect that a government will be well-modelled by a people, who know not how to make a spinning wheel, or to employ a loom to advantage? Not to mention, that all ignorant ages are infested with superstition, which throws the government off its bias, and disturbs men in the pursuit of their interest and happiness

Knowledge in the arts of government naturally begets mildness and moderation, by instructing men in the advantages of humane maxims above rigour and severity, which drive subjects into rebellion, and make the return to submission impracticable, by cutting off all hopes of pardon When the tempers of men are softened as well as their knowledge improved, this humanity appears still more conspicuous, and is the chief characteristic which distinguishes a civilized age from times of barbarity and ignorance Factions are then less inveterate, revolutions less tragical, authority less severe, and seditions less frequent. Even foreign wars abate of their cruelty, and after the field of battle, where honour and interest steel men against compassion, as well as fear, the combatants divest themselves of the brute, and resume the man

Nor need we fear, that men, by losing their ferocity, will lose their martial spirit, or become less undaunted and vigorous in defence of their country or their liberty The arts have no such effect in enervating either the mind or body On the contrary, industry, their inseparable attendant, adds new force to both And if anger, which is said to be the whetstone of courage, loses somewhat of its asperity,

* The inscription on the Place-de-Vendome says 440,000.

by politeness and refinement, a sense of honour, which is a stronger, more constant and more governable principle, acquires fresh vigour by that elevation of genius which arises from knowledge and a good education. Add to this, that courage can neither have any duration, nor be of any use, when not accompanied with discipline and martial skill, which are seldom found among a barbarous people. The ancients remarked, that Datames was the only barbarian that ever knew the art of war. And Pyrrhus, seeing the Romans marshal their army with some art and skill, said with surprise, *These barbarians have nothing barbarous in their discipline!* It is observable, that, as the old Romans, by applying themselves solely to war, were almost the only uncivilized people that ever possessed military discipline, so the modern Italians are the only civilized people, among Europeans, that ever wanted courage and a martial spirit. Those who would ascribe this effeminacy of the Italians to their luxury, or politeness, or applications to the arts, need but consider the French and English, whose bravery is as uncontestible, as their love for the arts, and their assiduity in commerce. The Italian historians give us a more satisfactory reason for this degeneracy of their countrymen. They show us how the sword was dropped at once by all the Italian sovereigns, while the Venetian aristocracy was jealous of its subjects, the Florentine democracy applied itself entirely to commerce, Rome was governed by priests and Naples by women. War then became the business of soldiers of fortune, who spared one another, and, to the astonishment of the world, could engage a whole day in what they called a battle, and return at night to their camp, without the least bloodshed.

What has chiefly induced several moralists to declaim against refinement in the arts, is the example of ancient Rome, which, joining to its poverty and rusticity virtue and public spirit, rose to such a surprising height of grandeur and liberty, but having learned from its conquered provinces the Asiatic luxury, fell into every kind of corruption, whence arose sedition and civil wars, attended at last with the total loss of liberty. All the Latin classics, whom we peruse in our infancy, are full of these sentiments, and universally ascribe the ruin of their state to the arts and riches imported from the East: insomuch that Sallust represents a taste for painting as a vice no less than lewdness and drinking. And so popular were these sentiments during the latter ages of the republic, that this author abounds in praises of the old rigid Roman virtue, though himself the most egregious instance of modern luxury and corruption, speaks contemptuously of the Grecian eloquence, though the most elegant writer in the world, nay, employs preposterous digressions and declamations to this purpose, though a model of taste and correctness.

But it would be easy to prove, that these writers mistook the cause

of the disorders in the Roman state, and ascribed to luxury and the arts, what really proceeded from an ill-modelled government, and the unlimited extent of conquests Refinement on the pleasures and conveniences of life has no natural tendency to beget venality and corruption The value which all men put upon any particular pleasure, depends on comparison and experience, nor is a porter less greedy of money, which he spends on bacon and brandy, than a courtier, who purchases champagne and ortolans Riches are valuable at all times, and to all men, because they always purchase pleasures, such as men are accustomed to and desire nor can any thing restrain or regulate the love of money, but a sense of honour and virtue, which, if it be not nearly equal at all times, will naturally abound most in ages of knowledge and refinement

Of all European kingdoms Poland seems the most defective in the arts of war as well as peace, mechanical as well as liberal, yet it is there that venality and corruption do most prevail The nobles seem to have preserved their crown elective for no other purpose, than regularly to sell it to the highest bidder This is almost the only species of commerce with which that people are acquainted

The liberties of England, so far from decaying since the improvements in the arts, have never flourished so much as during that period And though corruption may seem to increase of late years, this is chiefly to be ascribed to our established liberty, when our princes have found the impossibility of governing without parliaments, or of terrifying parliaments by the phantom of prerogative Not to mention, that this corruption or venality prevails much more among the electors than the elected, and therefore cannot justly be ascribed to any refinements in luxury

If we consider the matter in a proper light, we shall find, that a progress in the arts is rather favourable to liberty, and has a natural tendency to preserve, if not produce a free government In rude unpolished nations, where the arts are neglected, all labour is bestowed on the cultivation of the ground, and the whole society is divided into two classes, proprietors of land, and their vassals or tenants The latter are necessarily dependent, and fitted for slavery and subjection, especially where they possess no riches, and are not valued for their knowledge in agriculture, as must always be the case where the arts are neglected The former naturally erect themselves into petty tyrants, and must either submit to an absolute master, for the sake of peace and order, or if they will preserve their independency, like the ancient barons, they must fall into feuds and contests among themselves, and throw the whole society into such confusion, as is perhaps worse than the most despotic government. But where luxury nourishes commerce and industry, the peasants, by a proper cultivation of the land, become rich and independent:

while the tradesmen and merchants acquire a share of the property, and draw authority and consideration to that middling rank of men, who are the best and firmest basis of public liberty. These submit not to slavery, like the peasants, from poverty and meanness of spirit; and having no hopes of tyrannizing over others, like the barons, they are not tempted, for the sake of that gratification, to submit to the tyranny of their sovereign. They covet equal laws, which may secure their property, and preserve them from monarchical, as well as aristocratical tyranny.

The lower house is the support of our popular government; and all the world acknowledges, that it owed its chief influence and consideration to the increase of commerce, which threw such a balance of property into the hands of the Commons. How inconsistent, then, is it to blame so violently a refinement in the arts, and to represent it as the bane of liberty and public spirit!

To declaim against present times, and magnify the virtue of remote ancestors, is a propensity almost inherent in human nature: and as the sentiments and opinions of civilized ages alone are transmitted to posterity, hence it is that we meet with so many severe judgments pronounced against luxury, and even science; and hence it is that at present we give so ready an assent to them. But the fallacy is easily perceived, by comparing different nations that are contemporaries; where we both judge more impartially, and can better set in opposition those manners, with which we are sufficiently acquainted. Treachery and cruelty, the most pernicious and most odious of all vices, seem peculiar to uncivilized ages; and, by the refined Greeks and Romans, were ascribed to all the barbarous nations which surrounded them. They might justly, therefore, have presumed, that their ancestors, so highly celebrated, possessed no greater virtue, and were as much inferior to their posterity in honour and humanity, as in taste and science. An ancient Frank or Saxon may be highly extolled: but I believe every man would think his life or fortune much less secure in the hands of a Moor or Tartar, than in those of a French or English gentleman, the rank of men the most civilized in the most civilized nations.

We come now to the *second* position which we proposed to illustrate, to wit, that, as innocent luxury, or a refinement in the arts and conveniences of life, is advantageous to the public; so wherever luxury ceases to be innocent, it also ceases to be beneficial; and when carried a degree farther, begins to be a quality pernicious, though perhaps, not the most pernicious, to political society.

Let us consider what we call vicious luxury. A gratification is only vicious, when it engrosses all a man's expense, and leaves no ability for such acts of duty and generosity as are required by his situation and fortune. Suppose that he correct the vice, and employ

part of his expense in the education of his children, in the support of his friends, and in relieving the poor; would any prejudice result to society? On the contrary, the same consumption would arise; and that labour, which, at present, is employed only in producing a slender gratification to one man, would relieve the necessitous, and bestow satisfaction on hundreds. The same care and toil that raise a dish of pease at Christmas, would give bread to a whole family during six months. To say, that, without a vicious luxury, the labour would not have been employed at all, is only to say, that there is some other defect in human nature, such as indolence, selfishness, inattention to others, for which luxury, in some measure, provides a remedy; as one poison may be an antidote to another. But virtue, like wholesome food, is better than poisons, however corrected.

Suppose the same number of men, that are at present in Great Britain, with the same soil and climate; I ask, is it not possible for them to be happier, by the most perfect way of life that can be imagined, and by the greatest reformation that Omnipotence itself could work in their temper and disposition? To assert, that they cannot, appears evidently ridiculous. As the land is able to maintain more than all its present inhabitants, they could never, in such a Utopian state, feel any other ills than those which arise from bodily sickness; and these are not the half of human miseries. All other ills spring from some vice, either in ourselves or others; and even many of our diseases proceed from the same origin. Remove the vices, and the ills follow. You must only take care to remove all the vices. If you remove part, you may render the matter worse. By banishing *vicious* luxury, without curing sloth and an indifference to others, you only diminish industry in the state, and add nothing to men's charity or their generosity. Let us, therefore, rest contented with asserting, that two opposite vices in a state may be more advantageous than either of them alone; but let us never pronounce vice in itself advantageous. Is it not very inconsistent for an author to assert in one page, that moral distinctions are inventions of politicians for public interest; and in the next page maintain, that vice is advantageous to the public? [Fable of the Bees.] And indeed it seems, upon any system of morality, little less than a contradiction, in terms, to talk of a vice, which is in general beneficial to society.

I thought this reasoning necessary, in order to give some light to a philosophical question, which has been much disputed in England. I call it a *philosophical* question, not a *political* one. For whatever may be the consequence of such a miraculous transformation of mankind, as would endow them with every species of virtue, and free them from every species of vice, this concerns not the magistrate, who aims only at possibilities. He cannot cure every vice by substituting

a virtue in its place. Very often he can only cure one vice by another; and in that case, he ought to prefer what is least pernicious to society. Luxury, when excessive, is the source of many ills; but is in general preferable to sloth and idleness, which would commonly succeed in its place, and are more hurtful both to private persons and to the public. When sloth reigns, a mean uncultivated way of life prevails amongst individuals, without society, without enjoyment. And if the sovereign, in such a situation, demands the service of his subjects, the labour of the state suffices only to furnish the necessaries of life to the labourers, and can afford nothing to those who are employed in the public service.

XXV.—MONEY

MONEY is not, properly speaking, one of the subjects of commerce; but only the instrument which men have agreed upon to facilitate the exchange of one commodity for another. It is none of the wheels of trade: it is the oil which renders the motions of the wheels more smooth and easy. If we consider any one kingdom by itself, it is evident, that the greater or less plenty of money is of no consequence; since the prices of commodities are always proportioned to the plenty of money, and a crown in Harry VII's time served the same purpose as a pound does at present. It is only the *public* which draws any advantage from the greater plenty of money; and that only in its wars and negociations with foreign states. And this is the reason why all rich and trading countries, from Carthage to Great Britain and Holland, have employed mercenary troops, which they hired from their poorer neighbours. Were they to make use of their native subjects, they would find less advantage from their superior riches, and from their great plenty of gold and silver; since the pay of all their servants must rise in proportion to the public opulence. Our small army of 20,000 men is maintained at as great expense as a French army twice as numerous. The English fleet, during the late war, required as much money to support it as all the Roman legions, which kept the whole world in subjection, during the time of the emperors.*

* A private soldier in the Roman infantry had a denarius a day, somewhat less than eightpence. The Roman emperors had commonly 25 legions in pay, which, allowing 5000 men to a legion, makes 125,000. *Tacit. Ann. lib. iv.* It is true, there were also auxiliaries to the legions; but their numbers are uncertain, as well as their pay. To consider only the legionaries, the pay of the private men could not exceed 1,600,000*l.* Now, the parliament in the last war commonly allowed for the fleet 2,500,000*l.* We have therefore 900,000 over for the officers and other expences of the Roman legions. There seem to have been but few officers in the Roman armies, in comparison of what are employed in all our modern troops, except some Swiss corps. And these officers had very small pay; a centurion, for instance, only double a common soldier. And as the soldiers from their pay (Tacit.

The great number of people, and their greater industry, are serviceable in all cases, at home and abroad, in private and in public. But the greater plenty of money is very limited in its use, and may even sometimes be a loss to a nation in its commerce with foreigners.

There seems to be a happy concurrence of causes in human affairs, which checks the growth of trade and riches, and hinders them from being confined entirely to one people, as might naturally at first be dreaded from the advantages of an established commerce. Where one nation has gotten the start of another in trade, it is very difficult for the latter to regain the ground it has lost, because of the superior industry and skill of the former, and the greater stock, of which its merchants are possessed, and which enabled them to trade on so much smaller profits. But these advantages are compensated, in some measure, by the low price of labour in every nation which has not an extensive commerce, and does not much abound in gold and silver. Manufactures, therefore, gradually shift their places, leaving those countries and provinces which they have already enriched, and flying to others, whither they are allured by the cheapness of provisions and labour, till they have enriched these also, and are again banished by the same causes. And in general we may observe, that the dearness of every thing, from plenty of money, is a disadvantage, which attends an established commerce, and set bounds to it in every country, by enabling the poorer states to undersell the richer in all foreign markets.

This has made me entertain a doubt concerning the benefit of *banks* and *paper credit*, which are so generally esteemed advantageous to every nation. That provisions and labour should become dear by the increase of trade and money, is, in many respects, an inconvenience, but an inconvenience that is unavoidable, and the effect of that public wealth and prosperity which are the end of all our wishes. It is compensated by the advantages which we reap from the possession of these precious metals, and the weight which they give the nation in all foreign wars and negotiations. But there appears no reason for increasing that inconvenience by a counterfeit money, which foreigners will not accept of in any payment, and which any great disorder in the state will reduce to nothing. There are, it is true, many people in every rich state, who having large sums of money, would prefer paper with good security, as being of more easy transport and more safe custody. If the public provide not a bank, private bankers will take

Ann. lib. 4.) bought their own clothes, arms, tents, and baggage, this must also diminish considerably the other charges of the army. So little expensive was that mighty government and so easy was its yoke over the world. And, indeed, this is the more natural conclusion from the foregoing calculations. For money, after the conquest of Egypt, seems to have been nearly in as great plenty at Rome as it is at present in the richest of the European kingdoms.

advantage of this circumstance, as the goldsmiths formerly did in London, or as the bankers do at present in Dublin and therefore it is better, it may be thought, that a public company should enjoy the benefit of that paper-credit, which always will have place in every opulent kingdom But to endeavour artificially to increase such a credit, can never be the interest of any trading nation, but must lay them under disadvantages, by increasing money beyond its natural proportion to labour and commodities, and thereby heightening their price to the merchant and manufacturer And in this view, it must be allowed, that no bank could be more advantageous than such a one as locked up all the money it received*, and never augmented the circulating coin, as is usual, by returning part of its treasure into commerce. A public bank, by this expedient, might cut off much of the dealings of private bankers and money jobbers, and though the state bore the charge of salaries to the directors and tellers of this bank (for, according to the preceding supposition, it would have no profit from its dealings), the national advantage, resulting from the low price of labour and the destruction of paper credit, would be a sufficient compensation. Not to mention, that so large a sum, lying ready at command, would be a convenience in times of great public danger and distress, and what part of it was used might be replaced at leisure, when peace and tranquillity was restored to the nation.

But of this subject of paper-credit we shall treat more largely hereafter And I shall finish this essay on money, by proposing and explaining two observations, which may perhaps, serve to employ the thoughts of our speculative politicians

It was a shrewd observation of Anacharsis† the Scythian, who had never seen money in his own country, that gold and silver seemed to him of no use to the Greeks, but to assist them in numeration and arithmetic It is indeed evident, that money is nothing but the representation of labour and commodities, and serves only as a method of rating or estimating them Where coin is in greater plenty, as a greater quantity of it is required to represent the same quantity of goods, it can have no effect, either good or bad, taking a nation within itself, any more than it would make an alteration on a merchant's books, if, instead of the Arabian method of notation, which requires few characters, he should make use of the Roman, which requires a great many Nay, the greater quantity of money, like the Roman characters, is rather inconvenient, and requires greater trouble both to keep and transport it. But notwithstanding this conclusion, which must be allowed just, it is certain, that, since the discovery of the mines in America industry has increased in all the nations of Europe, except in the possessors of those mines, and this may justly

* This is the case with the bank of Amsterdam.

† Plut. *Quomodo quis suos profectus in virtute sentire possit.*

be ascribed, amongst other reasons, to the increase of gold and silver. Accordingly we find, that, in every kingdom, into which money begins to flow in greater abundance than formerly, every thing takes a new face labour and industry gain life, the merchant becomes more enterprising, the manufacturer more diligent and skilful, and even the farmer follows his plough with greater alacrity and attention. This is not easily to be accounted for, if we consider only the influence which a greater abundance of coin has in the kingdom itself, by heightening the price of commodities, and obliging every one to pay a greater number of these little yellow or white pieces for every thing he purchases And as to foreign trade, it appears, that great plenty of money is rather disadvantageous, by raising the price of every kind of labour

To account, then, for this phenomenon, we must consider, that though the high price of commodities be a necessary consequence of the increase of gold and silver, yet it follows not immediately upon that increase, but some time is required before the money circulates through the whole state and makes its effect be felt on all ranks of people At first, no alteration is perceived, by degrees the price rises, first of one commodity, then of another, till the whole at last reaches a just proportion with the new quantity of specie which is in the kingdom In my opinion, it is only in this interval or intermediate situation, between the acquisition of money and rise of prices, that the increasing quantity of gold and silver is favourable to industry When any quantity of money is imported into a nation, it is not at first dispersed into many hands, but is confined to the coffers of a few persons, who immediately seek to employ it to advantage Here are a set of manufacturers or merchants, we shall suppose, who have received returns of gold and silver for goods which they sent to Cadiz. They are thereby enabled to employ more workmen than formerly, who never dream of demanding higher wages, but are glad of employment from such good paymasters If workmen become scarce, the manufacturer gives higher wages, but at first requires an increase of labour, and this is willingly submitted to by the artisan, who can now eat and drink better, to compensate his additional toil and fatigue He carries his money to market, where he finds every thing at the same price as formerly, but returns with greater quantity, and of better kinds, for the use of his family The farmer and gardener, finding that all their commodities are taken off, apply themselves with alacrity to the raising more, and at the same time can afford to take better and more clothes from their tradesmen, whose price is the same as formerly, and their industry only whetted by so much new gain It is easy to trace the money in its progress through the whole commonwealth; where we shall find, that it must first quicken the diligence of every individual, before it increase the price of labour.

And that the specie may increase to a considerable pitch, before it have this latter effect, appears, amongst other instances, from the frequent operations of the French king on the money, where it was always found, that the augmenting of the numerary value did not produce a proportional rise of the prices, at least for some time. In the last year of Louis XIV. money was raised three sevenths, but prices augmented only one. Corn in France is now sold at the same price, or for the same number of livres, it was in 1683, though silver was then at 30 livres the mark, and is now at 50.* Not to mention the great addition of gold and silver, which may have come into that kingdom since the former period.

From the whole of this reasoning we may conclude, that it is of no manner of consequence, with regard to the domestic happiness of a state, whether money be in a greater or less quantity. The good policy of the magistrate consists only in keeping it, if possible, still increasing; because by that means, he keeps alive a spirit of industry in the nation, and increases the stock of labour, in which consists all real power and riches. A nation, whose money decreases, is actually at that time weaker and more miserable than another nation which possesses no more money, but is on the increasing hand. This will be easily accounted for, if we consider that the alterations in the quantity of money, either on one side or the other, are not immediately attended with proportionable alterations in the price of commodities. There is always an interval before matters be adjusted to their new situation; and this interval is as pernicious to industry, when gold and silver are diminishing, as it is advantageous when these metals are increasing. The workman has not the same employment from the manufacturer and merchant, though he pays the same price for every thing in the market. The farmer cannot dispose of his corn and cattle though he must pay the same rent to his landlord. The poverty, and beggary, and sloth, which must ensue, are easily foreseen.

II. The second observation which I proposed to make with regard to money, may be explained after the following manner. There are

* These facts I give upon the authority of M. du Tot in his Reflections Politiques, an author of reputation. Though I must confess, that the facts which he advances on other occasions, are often so suspicious, as to make his authority less in this matter. However, the general observation, that the augmenting of the money in France does not at first proportionably augment the prices, is certainly just.

By the bye, this seems to be one of the best reasons which can be given, for a gradual and universal increase of the denomination of money, though it has been entirely overlooked in all those volumes which have been written on that question by Melon, du Tot, and Paris de Verney. Were all our money, for instance, recoined, and a penny's worth of silver taken from every shilling, the new shilling would probably purchase every thing that could have been bought by the old; the prices of every thing would thereby be insensibly diminished; foreign trade enlivened; and domestic industry, by the circulation of a great number of pounds and shillings, would receive some increase and encouragement. In executing such a project, it would be better to make the new shilling pass for 24 halfpence, in order to preserve the illusion, and to make it be taken for the same. And as a recoinage of our silver begins to be requisite, by the continual wearing of our shillings and sixpences, it may be doubtful, whether we ought to imitate the example in King William's reign, when the clipt money was raised to the old standard.

some kingdoms, and many provinces in Europe, (and all of them were once in the same condition), where money is so scarce, that the landlord can get none at all from his tenants, but is obliged to take his rent in kind, and either to consume it himself, or transport it to places where he may find a market. In those countries, the prince can levy few or no taxes but in the same manner; and as he will receive small benefit from impositions so paid, it is evident that such a kingdom has little force even at home, and cannot maintain fleets and armies to the same extent as if every part of it abounded in gold and silver. There is surely a greater disproportion between the force of Germany, at present, and what it was three centuries ago,* than there is in its industry, people, and manufactures. The Austrian dominions in the empire are in general well peopled and well cultivated, and are of great extent, but have not a proportionable weight in the balance of Europe; proceeding, as is commonly supposed, from the scarcity of money. How do all these facts agree with that principle of reason, that the quantity of gold and silver is in itself altogether indifferent? According to that principle, wherever a sovereign has numbers of subjects, and these have plenty of commodities, he should of course be great and powerful, and they rich and happy, independent of the greater or lesser abundance of the precious metals. These admit of divisions and subdivisions to a great extent; and where the pieces might become so small as to be in danger of being lost, it is easy to mix the gold or silver with a baser metal, as is practised in some countries of Europe, and by that means raise the pieces to a bulk more sensible and convenient. They still serve the same purposes of exchange, whatever their number may be, or whatever colour they may be supposed to have.

To these difficulties I answer, that the effect, here supposed to flow from scarcity of money, really arises from the manners and customs of the people; and that we mistake, as is too usual, a collateral effect for a cause. The contradiction is only apparent; but it requires some thought and reflection to discover the principles by which we can reconcile *reason* to *experience*.

It seems a maxim almost self-evident, that the prices of everything depend on the proportion between commodities and money, and that any considerable alteration on either has the same effect, either of heightening or lowering the price. Increase the commodities, they become cheaper; increase the money, they rise in their value. As, on the other hand, a diminution of the former, and that of the latter, have contrary tendencies.

It is also evident, that the prices do not so much depend on the absolute quantity of commodities and that of money which are in a

* The Italians gave to the emperor Maximilian the nickname of POCCI DANARI. None of the enterprises of that prince ever succeeded, for want of money.

nation, as on that of the commodities which come or may come to market, and of the money which circulates. If the coin be locked up in chests, it is the same thing with regard to prices, as if it were annihilated; if the commodities be hoarded in magazines and granaries, a like effect follows. As the money and commodities, in these cases, never meet, they cannot affect each other. Were we, at any time, to form conjectures concerning the price of provisions, the corn, which the farmer must reserve for seed, and for the maintenance of himself and family, ought never to enter into the estimation. It is only the overplus, compared to the demand, that determines the value.

To apply these principles, we must consider, that in the first and more uncultivated ages of any state, ere fancy has confounded her wants with those of nature, men, content with the produce of their own fields, or with those rude improvements which they themselves can work upon them, have little occasion for exchange, at least for money, which, by argument, is the common measure of exchange. The wool of the farmer's own flock, spun in his own family, and wrought by a neighbouring weaver, who receives his payment in corn or wool, suffices for furniture and clothing. The carpenter, the smith, the mason, the tailor, are retained by wages of a like nature; and the landlord himself, dwelling in the neighbourhood, is content to receive his rent in the commodities raised by the farmer. The greater part of these he consumes at home, in rustic hospitality: the rest, perhaps, he disposes of for money to the neighbouring town, whence he draws the few materials of his expense and luxury.

But after men begin to refine on all these enjoyments, and live not always at home, nor are content with what can be raised in their neighbourhood, there is more exchange and commerce of all kinds, and more money enters into that exchange. The tradesmen will not be paid in corn, because they want something more than barely to eat. The farmer goes beyond his own parish for the commodities he purchases, and cannot always carry his commodities to the merchant who supplies him. The landlord lives in the capital, or in a foreign country; and demands his rent in gold and silver which can easily be transported to him. Great undertakers, and manufacturers, and merchants, arise in every commodity; and these can conveniently deal in nothing but in specie. And conveniently, in this situation of society, the coin enters into many more contracts, and by that means is much more employed than in the former.

The necessary effect is, that, provided the money increase not in the nation, every thing must become much cheaper in times of industry and refinement, than in rude uncultivated ages. It is the proportion between the circulating money, and the commodities in the market, which determines the prices. Goods, that are consumed

at home, or exchanged with other goods in the neighbourhood, never come to market, they affect not in the least the current specie; with regard to it they are as if totally annihilated, and consequently this method of using them sinks the proportion on the side of all the commodities, and increase prices But after money enters into contracts and sales, and is everywhere the measure of exchange, the same national cash has a much greater task to perform, all commodities are then in the market, the sphere of circulation is enlarged, it is the same case as if that individual sum were to serve a larger kingdom, and therefore, the proportion being lessened on the side of the money, every thing must become cheaper, and the price gradually fall.

By the most exact computations, that, have been formed all over Europe, after making allowance for the alteration in the numerary value or the denomination, it is found, that the prices of all things have only risen three, or, at most four times since the discovery of the West Indies But will any one assert, that there is not much more than four times the coin in Europe, that there was in the fifteenth century, and the centuries preceding it? The Spaniards and Portuguese from their mines, the English, French, and Dutch, by their African trade, and by their interlopers in the West Indies, bring home about six millions a year of which not above a third goes to the East Indies This sum alone, in ten years, would probably double the ancient stock of money in Europe And no other satisfactory reason can be given, why all prices have not risen to a much more exorbitant height, except that which is derived from a change of customs and manners. Besides that more commodities are produced by additional industry, the same commodities come more to market, after men depart from their ancient simplicity of manners And though this increase has not been equal to that of money, it has, however, been considerable, and has preserved the proportion between coin and commodities nearer the ancient standard

Were the question proposed, which of these methods of living in the people, the simple or refined, is the most advantageous to the estate or public? I should, without much scruple, prefer the latter, in a view to politics at least, and should produce this as an additional reason for the encouragement of trade and manufactures,

While men live in the ancient simple manner, and supply all their necessaries from domestic industry, or from the neighbourhood, the sovereign can levy no taxes in money from a considerable part of his subjects, and if he will impose on them any burthens, he must take payment in commodities, with which alone they abound; a method attended with such great and obvious inconveniences, that they need not here be insisted on. All the money he can pretend to raise, must be from his principal cities, where alone it circulates; and these, it is evident, cannot afford him so much as the whole state could, did gold

and silver circulate throughout the whole But besides this obvious diminution of the revenue, there is another cause of the poverty of the public in such a situation Not only the sovereign receives less money, but the same money goes not so far as in times of industry and general commerce Every thing is dearer, where the gold and silver are supposed equal, and that because fewer commodities come to market, and the whole coin bears a higher proportion to what is to be purchased by it, whence alone the prices of every thing are fixed and determined

Here then we may learn the fallacy of the remark, often to be met with in historians, and even in common conversation, that any particular state is weak, though fertile, populous, and well cultivated, merely because it wants money It appears, that the want of money can never injure any state within itself for men and commodities are the real strength of any community It is the simple manner of living which here hurts the public, by confining the gold and silver to few hands, and preventing its universal diffusion and circulation. On the contrary, industry and refinements of all kinds incorporate it with the whole state, however small its quantity may be they digest it into every vein, so to speak, and make it enter into every transaction and contract No hand is entirely empty of it And as the prices of every thing fall by that means, the sovereign has a double advantage he may draw money by his taxes from every part of the state, and what he receives, goes farther in every purchase and payment

We may infer, from a comparison of prices, that money is not more plentiful in China, than it was in Europe three centuries ago but what immense power is that empire possessed of, if we may judge by the civil and military establishment maintained by it? Polybius [Lib II cap 15] tells us, that provisions were so cheap in Italy during his time, that in some places the stated price for a meal at the inns was a *semis* a head, little more than a farthing! Yet the Roman power had even then subdued the whole known world. About a century before that period, the Carthaginian ambassador said, by way of raillery, that no people lived more sociably amongst themselves than the Romans, for that, in every entertainment, which, as foreign ministers, they received, they still observed the same plate at every table. [Plin lib. xxxiii. cap. 11] The absolute quantity of the precious metals is a matter of great indifference There are only two circumstances of any importance, namely, their gradual increase, and their thorough concoction and circulation through the state, and the influence of both those circumstances has here been explained.

In the following essay we shall see an instance of a like fallacy as that above mentioned; where a collateral effect is taken for a cause, and where a consequence is ascribed to the plenty of money; though it be really owing to a change in the manners and customs of the people.

XXVI.—OF INTEREST.

NOTHING is esteemed a more certain sign of the flourishing condition of any nation than the lowness of interest and with reason, though I believe the cause is somewhat different from what is commonly apprehended Lowness of interest is generally ascribed to plenty of money But money, however plentiful, has no other effect, *if fixed*, than to raise the price of labour Silver is more common than gold, and therefore you receive a greater quantity of it for the same commodities. But do you pay less interest for it? Interest in Batavia and Jamaica is at 10 *per cent*, in Portugal at 6, though these places, as we may learn from the prices of every thing, abound more in gold and silver than either London or Amsterdam.

Were all the gold in England annihilated at once, and one and twenty shillings substituted in the place of every guinea, would money be more plentiful, or interest lower? No, surely we should only use silver instead of gold Were gold rendered as common as silver, and silver as common as copper, would money be more plentiful or interest lower? We may assuredly give the same answer Our shillings would then be yellow, and our halfpence white, and we should have no guineas No other difference would ever be observed, no alteration on commerce, manufactures, navigation, or interest, unless we imagine that the colour of the metal is of any consequence

Now, what is so visible in these greater variations of scarcity or abundance in the precious metals, must hold in all inferior changes If the multiplying of gold and silver fifteen times makes no difference, much less can the doubling or tripling them. All augmentation has no other effect than to heighten the price of labour and commodities, and even this variation is little more than that of a name In the progress towards these changes, the augmentation may have some influence, by exciting industry, but after the prices are settled, suitably to the new abundance of gold and silver, it has no manner of influence

An effect always holds proportion with its cause Prices have risen near four times since the discovery of the Indies, and it is probable gold and silver have multiplied much more but interest has not fallen much above half The rate of interest, therefore, is not derived from the quantity of the precious metals.

Money having chiefly a fictitious value, the greater or less plenty of it is of no consequence, if we consider a nation within itself; and the quantity of specie, when once fixed, though ever so large, has no other effect, than to oblige every one to tell out a greater number of

those shining bits of metal, for clothes, furniture, or equipage, without increasing any one convenience of life If a man borrow money to build a house, he then carries home a greater load, because the stone, timber, lead, glass &c, with the labour of the masons and carpenters, are represented by a greater quantity of gold and silver But as these metals are considered chiefly as representations, there can no alteration arise, from their bulk or quantity, their weight or colour, either upon their real value or their interest The same interest, in all cases, bears the same proportion to the sum And if you lent me so much labour and so many commodities, by receiving five *per cent* you always receive proportional labour and commodities, however represented, whether by yellow or white coin, whether by a pound or an ounce. It is in vain, therefore, to look for the cause of the fall or rise of interest in the greater or less quantity of gold and silver, which is fixed in any nation

High interest arises from *three* circumstances a great demand for borrowing, little riches to supply that demand, and great profits arising from commerce and the circumstances are a clear proof of the small advance of commerce, and industry, not of the scarcity of gold and silver Low interest, on the other hand, proceeds from the three opposite circumstances a small demand for borrowing, great riches to supply that demand, and small profits arising from commerce and these circumstances are all connected together, and proceed from the increase of industry and commerce, not of gold and silver We shall endeavour to prove these points, and shall begin with the causes and the effects of a great or small demand for borrowing

When a people have emerged ever so little from a savage state and their numbers have increased beyond the original multitude, there must immediately arise an inequality of property, and while some possess large tracts of land, others are confined within narrow limits, and some are entirely without any landed property Those who possess more land than they can labour, employ those who possess none, and agree to receive a determinate part of the product Thus the *landed* interest is immediately established, nor is there any settled government, however rude, in which affairs are not on this footing Of these proprietors of land, some must presently discover themselves to be of different tempers from others, and while one would willingly store up the produce of his land for futurity, another desires to consume at present what should suffice for many years But as the spending of a settled revenue is a way of life entirely without occupation, men have so much need of somewhat to fix and engage them, that pleasures, such as they are, will be the pursuit of the greater part of the landholders, and the prodigals among them will always be more numerous than the misers. In a state, therefore, where there is nothing but a landed interest, as there is little frugality, the borrowers must be

very numerous, and the rate of interest must hold proportion to it. The difference depends not on the quantity of money, but on the habits and manners which prevail By this alone the demand for borrowing is increased or diminished Where money is so plentiful as to make an egg be sold for sixpence so long as there are only landed gentry and peasants in the state, the borrowers must be numerous, and interest high The rent for the same farm would be heavier and more bulky but the same idleness of the landlord, with the high price of commodities, would dissipate it in the same time, and produce the same necessity and demand for borrowing

Nor is the case different with regard to the *second* circumstance which we proposed to consider, namely, the great or little riches to supply the demand This effect also depends on the habits and way of living of the people, not on the quantity of gold and silver In order to have, in any state, a greater number of lenders, it is not sufficient nor requisite, that there be great abundance of the precious metals It is only requisite, that the property or command of that quantity, which is in the state, whether great or small, should be collected in particular hands, so as to form considerable sums, or compose a great monied interest This begets a number of lenders, and sinks the rate of usury, and this, I shall venture to affirm, depends not on the quantity of specie, but on particular manners and customs, which make the specie gather into separate sums or masses of considerable value

For suppose that, by miracle, every man in Great Britain should have five pounds slipt into his pocket in one night, this would much more than double the whole money that is at present in the kingdom, yet there would not next day, nor for some time, be any more lenders, nor any variation in the interest And were there nothing but landlords and peasants in the state, this money, however abundant, could never gather into sums, and would only serve to increase the prices of everything, without any farther consequence The prodigal landlord dissipates it as fast as he receives it, and the beggarly peasant has no means, nor view, nor ambition of obtaining above a bare livelihood The overplus of borrowers above that of lenders continuing still the same, there will follow no reduction of interest That depends upon another principle; and must proceed from an increase of industry and frugality, of arts and commerce

Everything useful to the life of man arises from the ground, but few things arise in that condition which is requisite to render them useful There must, therefore, beside the peasants and the proprietors of land, be another rank of men, who, receiving from the former the rude materials, work them into their proper form, and retain part for their own use and subsistence In the infancy of society, these contracts between the artizans and the peasants, and between one species of artizans and another, are commonly entered into immediately by the

persons themselves, who being neighbours, are easily acquainted with each other's necessities, and can lend their mutual assistance to supply them. But when men's industry increases, and their views enlarge, it is found, that the most remote parts of the state can assist each other as well as the more contiguous, and that this intercourse of good offices may be carried on to the greatest extent and intricacy. Hence the origin of *merchants*, one of the most useful races of men, who serve as agents between those parts of the state, that are wholly unacquainted, and are ignorant of each other's necessities. Here are in a city fifty workmen in silk and linen, and a thousand customers; and these two ranks of men, so necessary to each other, can never rightly meet, till one man erects a shop, to which all the workmen and all the customers repair. In this province, grass rises in abundance: the inhabitants abound in cheese, and butter, and cattle; but want bread and corn, which, in a neighbouring province, are in too great abundance for the use of the inhabitants. One man discovers this. He brings corn from the one province, and returns with cattle; and, supplying the wants of both, he is, so far, a common benefactor. As the people increase in numbers and industry, the difficulty of their intercourse increases: the business of the agency or merchandize becomes more intricate; and divides, subdivides, compounds and mixes to a greater variety. In all these transactions it is necessary, and reasonable, that a considerable part of the commodities and labour should belong to the merchant, to whom in a great measure, they are owing. And these commodities he will sometimes preserve in kind, or more commonly convert into money, which is their common representation. If gold and silver have increased in the state together with the industry, it will require a great quantity of these metals to represent a great quantity of commodities and labour. If industry alone has increased, the prices of everything must sink, and a small quantity of specie will serve as a representation.

There is no craving or demand of the human mind more constant and insatiable than that for exercise and employment; and this desire seems the foundation of most of our passions and pursuits. Deprive a man of all business and serious occupation, he runs restless from one amusement to another; and the weight and oppression, which he feels from idleness, is so great, that he forgets the ruin which must follow him from his immoderate expenses. Give him a more harmless way of employing his mind or body, he is satisfied, and feels no longer that insatiable thirst after pleasure. But if the employment you give him be lucrative, especially if the profit be attached to every particular exertion of industry, he has gain so often in his eye, that he acquires, by degrees, a passion for it, and knows no such pleasure as that of seeing the daily increase of his fortune. And this is the reason why trade increases frugality, and why, among merchants, there is the

same overplus of misers above prodigals, as, among the possessors of land, there is the contrary

Commerce increases industry, by conveying it readily from one member of the state to another, and allowing none of it to perish or become useless It increases frugality, by giving occupation to men, and employing them in the arts of gain, which soon engage their affection, and remove all relish for pleasure and expense It is an infallible consequence of all industrious professions to beget frugality, and make the love of gain prevail over the love of pleasure Among lawyers and physicians who have any practice, there are many more who live within their income, than who exceed it, or even live up to it. But lawyers and physicians beget no industry, and it is even at the expense of others they acquire their riches, so that they are sure to diminish the possessions of some of their fellow-citizens, as fast as they increase their own Merchants, on the contrary, beget industry, by serving as canals to convey it through every corner of the state and at the same time, by their frugality, they acquire great power over that industry, and collect a large property in the labour and commodities, which they are the chief instruments in producing There is no other profession, therefore, except merchandize, which can make the monied interest considerable, or, in other words, can increase industry, and, by also increasing frugality, give a great command of that industry to particular members of the society Without commerce, the state must consist chiefly of landed gentry, whose prodigality and expense make a continual demand for borrowing, and of peasants, who have no sums to supply that demand The money never gathers into large stocks or sums, which can be lent at interest. It is dispersed into numberless hands, who either squander it in idle show and magnificence, or employ it in the purchase of the common necessaries of life Commerce alone assembles it into considerable sums, and this effect it has merely from the industry which it begets, and the frugality which it inspires, independent of that particular quantity of precious metal which may circulate in the state

Thus an increase of commerce, by a necessary consequence, raises a great number of lenders, and by that means produces lowness of interest. We must now consider how far this increase of commerce diminishes the profits arising from that profession, and gives rise to the *third* circumstance requisite to produce lowness of interest.

It may be proper to observe on this head, that low interest and low profits of merchandize, are two events that mutually forward each other, and are both originally derived from that extensive commerce, which produces opulent merchants, and renders the monied interest considerable Where merchants possess great stocks, whether represented by few or many pieces of metal, it must frequently happen, that, when they either become tired of business, or leave heirs unwilling or

unfit to engage in commerce, a great proportion of these riches naturally seeks an annual and secure revenue The plenty diminishes the price, and makes the lenders accept of a low interest This consideration obliges many to keep their stock employed in trade, and rather be content with low profits, than dispose of their money at an undervalue On the other hand, when commerce has become extensive, and employs large stocks, there must arise rivalships among the merchants, which diminish the profits of trade at the same time that they increase the trade itself The low profits of merchandize induce the merchants to accept more willingly of a low interest, when they leave off business, and begin to indulge themselves in ease and indolence. It is needless, therefore, to inquire which of these circumstances, to wit, *low interest*, or *low profits*, is the cause, and which the effect? They both arise from an extensive commerce, and mutually forward each other No man will accept of low profits, where he can have high interest, and no man will accept of low interest, where he can have high profits An extensive commerce, by producing large stocks, diminishes both interest and profits, and is always assisted, in its diminution of the one, by the proportional sinking of the other I may add, that, as low profits arise from the increase of commerce and industry, they serve in their turn to its farther increase, by rendering the commodities cheaper, encouraging the consumption and heightening the industry And thus if we consider the whole connection of causes and effects, interest is the barometer of the state, and its lowness is a sign almost infallible of the flourishing condition of a people It proves the increase of industry, and its prompt circulation, through the whole state, little inferior to a demonstration And though, perhaps it may not be impossible but a sudden and a great check to commerce may have a momentary effect of the same kind, by throwing so many stocks out of trade, it must be attended with such misery and want of employment to the poor, that, besides its short duration, it will not be possible to mistake the one case for the other

Those who have asserted, that the plenty of money was the cause of low interest, seem to have taken a collateral effect for a cause, since the same industry, which sinks the interest, commonly acquires great abundance of the precious metals. A variety of fine manufactures, with vigilant enterprising merchants, will soon draw money to a state, if it be any where to be found in the world. The same cause, by multiplying the conveniences of life, and increasing industry, collects great riches into the hands of persons, who are not proprietors of land, and produces, by that means, a lowness of interest. But though both these effects, plenty of money and low interest, naturally arise from commerce and industry, they are altogether independent of each other For suppose a

nation removed into the *Pacific* ocean, without any foreign commerce, or any knowledge of navigation suppose, that this nation possesses always the same stock of coin but is continually increasing in its numbers and industry it is evident, that the price of every commodity must gradually diminish in that kingdom since it is the proportion between money and any species of goods which fixes their mutual value and, upon the present supposition, the conveniences of life become every day more abundant, without any alteration in the current specie A less quantity of money, therefore, among this people, will make a rich man, during the times of industry, than would suffice to that purpose, in ignorant and slothful ages Less money will build a house, portion a daughter, buy an estate, support a manufactory, or maintain a family and equipage These are the uses for which men borrow money, and therefore, the greater or less quantity of it in a state has no influence on the interest But it is evident, that the greater or less stock of labour and commodities must have a great influence, since we really and in effect borrow these, when we take money upon interest It is true, when commerce is extended all over the globe, the most industrious nations always abound most with the precious metals so that low interest and plenty of money are in fact almost inseparable But still it is of consequence to know the principle whence any phenomenon arises, and to distinguish between a cause and a concomitant effect Besides that the speculation is curious, it may frequently be of use in the conduct of public affairs At least, it must be owned, that nothing can be of more use than to improve, by practice, the method of reasoning on these subjects, which of all others are the most important, though they are commonly treated in the loosest and most careless manner

Another reason of this popular mistake with regard to the cause of low interest, seems to be the instance of some nations, where, after a sudden acquisition of money, or of the precious metals, by means of foreign conquest, the interest has fallen, not only among them, but in all the neighbouring states, as soon as that money was dispersed, and had insinuated itself into every corner Thus, interest in Spain fell near a half immediately after the discovery of the West Indies, as we are informed by Garcilasso de la Vega and it has been ever since gradually sinking in every kingdom of Europe Interest in Rome, after the conquest of Egypt, fell from 6 to 4 *per cent* as we learn from Dion [Lib ii]

The causes of the sinking of interest, upon such an event, seem different in the conquering country and in the neighbouring states; but in neither of them can we justly ascribe that effect merely to the increase of gold and silver

In the conquering country, it is natural to imagine, that this new acquisition of money will fall into a few hands, and be gathered into

large sums, which seek a secure revenue, either by the purchase of land, or by interest, and consequently the same effect follows, for a little time, as if there had been a great accession of industry and commerce. The increase of lenders above the borrowers sinks the interest, and so much the faster, if those, who have acquired those large sums, find no industry or commerce in the state, and no method of employing their money but by lending it at interest. But after this new mass of gold and silver has been digested, and has circulated through the whole state, affairs will soon return to their former situation, while the landlords and new money-holders, living idly, squander above their income, and the former daily contract debt, and the latter encroach on their stock till its final extinction. The whole money may still be in the state, and make itself felt by the increase of prices: but not being now collected into any large masses or stocks, the disproportion between the borrowers and lenders is the same as formerly, and consequently the high interest returns.

Accordingly we find, in Rome, that, so early as Tiberius's time, interest had again mounted to 6 *per cent* [Columelli, lib. iii. cap. 3], though no accident had happened to drain the empire of money. In Trajan's time, money lent on mortgages in Italy, bore 6 *per cent* [Plinii Epist. lib. vii. ep. 18], on common securities in Bithynia, 12 [Id. lib. x. ep. 62.] And if interest in Spain has not risen to its old pitch, this can be ascribed to nothing but the continuance of the same cause that sunk it to wit, the large fortunes continually made in the Indies, which come over to Spain from time to time, and supply the demand of the borrowers. By this accidental and extraneous cause, more money is to be lent in Spain, that is, more money is collected into large sums, than would otherwise be found in a state where there are so little commerce and industry.

As to the reduction of interest, which has followed in England, France, and other kingdoms of Europe, that have no mines, it has been gradual, and has not proceeded from the increase of money, considered merely in itself, but from that of industry, which is the natural effect of the former increase, in that interval, before it raises the prices of labour and provisions. For to return to the foregoing supposition, if the industry of England had risen as much from other causes (and that rise might easily have happened, though the stock of money had remained the same), must not all the same consequences have followed, which we observe at present? The same people would in that case, be found in the kingdom, the same commodities, the same industry, manufactures, and commerce, and consequently the same merchants, with the same stocks, that is, with the same command over labour and commodities, only represented by a smaller number of white or yellow pieces, which, being a circumstance of no moment, would only affect the waggoner, porter, and trunk-maker.

Luxury, therefore, manufactures, arts, industry, frugality, flourishing equally as at present, it is evident, that interest must also have been as low, since that is the necessary result of all these circumstances, so far as they determine the profits of commerce, and the proportion between the borrowers and lenders in any state.

XXVII.—OF THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

It is very usual, in nations ignorant of the nature of commerce, to prohibit the exportation of commodities and to preserve among themselves whatever they think valuable and useful. They do not consider, that, in this prohibition, they act directly contrary to their intention, and that the more is exported of any commodity, the more will be raised at home, of which they themselves will always have the first offer.

It is well known to the learned, that the ancient laws of Athens rendered the exportation of figs criminal, that being supposed a species of fruit so excellent in Attica, that the Athenians deemed it too delicious for the palate of any foreigner. And in this ridiculous prohibition they were so much in earnest, that informers were thence called *sycophants* among them, from two Greek words, which signify *figs* and *discoverer* [PLUT. *De Curiositate*.] There are proofs in many old acts of parliament of the same ignorance in the nature of commerce, particularly in the reign of Edward III. And to this day, in France, the exportation of corn is almost always prohibited, in order, as they say, to prevent famines though it is evident, that nothing contributes more to the frequent famines, which so much distress that fertile country.

The same jealous fear, with regard to money, has also prevailed among several nations, and it required both reason and experience to convince any people, that these prohibitions serve to no other purpose than to raise the exchange against them, and produce a still greater exportation.

These errors, one may say, are gross and palpable but there still prevails, even in nations well acquainted with commerce, a strong jealousy with regard to the balance of trade, and a fear that all their gold and silver may be leaving them. This seems to me, almost in every case, a groundless apprehension, and I should as soon dread, that all our springs and rivers should be exhausted, as that money should abandon a kingdom where there are people and industry. Let

as carefully preserve these latter advantages and we need never be apprehensive of losing the former

It is easy to observe, that all calculations concerning the balance of trade are founded on very uncertain facts and suppositions The custom-house books are allowed to be an insufficient ground of reasoning; nor is the rate of exchange much better, unless we consider it with all nations, and know also the proportion of the several sums remitted, which one may safely pronounce impossible Every man, who has ever reasoned on this subject, has always proved his theory, whatever it was, by facts and calculations, and by an enumeration of all the commodities sent to all foreign kingdoms

The writings of Mr Gee struck the nation with an universal panic, when they saw it plainly demonstrated, by a detail of particulars, that the balance was against them for so considerable a sum as must leave them without a single shilling in five or six years But luckily, twenty years have since elapsed, with an expensive foreign war yet it is commonly supposed, that money is still more plentiful among us than in any former period

Nothing can be more entertaining on this head than Dr Swift, an author so quick in discerning the mistakes and absurdities of others He says, in his *Short View of the State of Ireland*, that the whole cash of that kingdom formerly amounted but to £500,000, that out of this the Irish remitted every year a neat million to England, and had scarcely any other source from which they could compensate themselves, and little other foreign trade than the importation of French wines, for which they paid ready money The consequence of this situation, which must be owned to be disadvantageous, was, that, in a course of three years, the current money of Ireland from £500,000, was reduced to less than two And at present, I suppose in a course of 30 years, it is absolutely nothing Yet I know not how that opinion of the advance of riches in Ireland, which gave the Doctor so much indignation, seems still to continue, and gain ground with every body

In short, this apprehension of the wrong balance of trade, appears of such a nature, that it discovers itself, wherever one is out of humour with the ministry, or is in low spirits, and as it can never be refuted by a particular detail of all the exports which counterbalance the imports, it may here be proper to form a general argument, that may prove the impossibility of this event, so long as we preserve our people and our industry.

Suppose four-fifths of all the money in Great Britain to be annihilated in one night, and the nation reduced to the same condition, with regard to specie, as in the reigns of the Harrys and Edwards, what would be the consequence? Must not the price of all labour and commodities sink in proportion, and every thing be sold as cheap

as they were in those ages? What nation could then dispute with us in any foreign market, or pretend to navigate or to sell manufactures at the same price, which to us would afford sufficient profit? In how little time, therefore must this, bring back the money which we had lost and raise us to the level of all the neighbouring nations? Where, after we have arrived, we immediately lose the advantage of the cheapness of labour and commodities, and the farther flowing in of money is stopped by our fulness and repletion.

Again, suppose, that all the money of Great Britain were multiplied fivefold in a night, must not the contrary effect follow? Must not all labour and commodities rise to such an exorbitant height, that no neighbouring nations could afford to buy from us, while their commodities, on the other hand, became comparatively so cheap, that, in spite of all the laws which could be formed, they would be run in upon us, and our money flow out, till we fall to a level with foreigners, and lose that great superiority of riches, which had laid us under such disadvantages?

Now, it is evident, that the same causes which would correct these exorbitant inequalities, were they to happen miraculously, must prevent their happening in the common course of nature, and must for ever, in all neighbouring nations, preserve money nearly proportionable to the art and industry of each nation. All water, wherever it communicates, remains always at a level. Ask naturalists the reason, they tell you, that, were it to be raised in any one place the superior gravity of that part not being balanced, must depress it, till it meets a counterpoise, and that the same cause, which redresses the inequality when it happens must for ever prevent it, without some violent and external operation.*

Can one imagine, that it had ever been possible, by any laws, or even by any art of industry, to have kept all the money in Spain which the galleons have brought from the Indies? Or that all commodities could be sold in France for a tenth of the price which they would yield on the other side of the Pyrenees, without finding their way thither, and draining from that immense treasure? What other reason, indeed, is there, why all nations, at present, gain in their trade with Spain and Portugal, but because it is impossible to heap up money, more than any fluid, beyond its proper level? The sovereigns of these countries have shown, that they wanted not inclination to keep their gold and silver to themselves, had it been in any degree practicable.

But as any body of water may be raised above the level of the sur-

* There is another cause, though more limited in its operation, which checks the wrong balance of trade, to every particular nation to which the kingdom trades. When we import more goods than we export, the exchange turns against us, and this becomes a new encouragement to export, as much as the charge of carriage and insurance of the money which becomes due would amount to. For the exchange can never rise but a little higher than the sum.

rounding element, if the former has no communication with the latter, so in money if the communication be cut off, by any material or physical impediment (for all laws alone are ineffectual), there may, in such a case, be a very great inequality of money. Thus the immense distance of China, together with the monopolies of our India companies, obstructing the communication, preserve in Europe the gold and silver, especially the latter, in much greater plenty than they are found in that kingdom. But, notwithstanding this great obstruction, the force of the causes above mentioned is still evident. The skill and ingenuity of Europe in general surpasses perhaps that of China, with regard to manual arts and manufactures, yet are we never able to trade thither without great disadvantage. And were it not for the continued recruits which we receive from America, money would soon sink in Europe, and rise in China, till it came nearly to a level in both places. Nor can any reasonable man doubt, but that industrious nation, were they as near us as Poland or Barbary, would drain us of the overplus of our specie, and draw to themselves a larger share of the West India treasures. We need not have recourse to a physical attraction, in order to explain the necessity of this operation. There is a moral attraction, arising from the interests and passions of men, which is full as potent and infallible.

How is the balance kept in the provinces of every kingdom among themselves, but by the force of this principle, which makes it impossible for money to lose its level, and either to rise or sink beyond the proportion of the labour and commodities which are in each province? Did not long experience make people easy on this head, what a fund of gloomy reflections might calculations afford to a melancholy Yorkshireman, while he computed and magnified the sums drawn to London by taxes, absentees, commodities, and found on comparison the opposite articles so much inferior? And no doubt had the *Heptarchy* subsisted in England, the legislature of each state had been continually alarmed by the fear of a wrong balance; and as it is probable that the mutual hatred of these states would have been extremely violent on account of their close neighbourhood, they would have loaded and oppressed all commerce, by a jealous and superfluous caution. Since the union has removed the barriers between Scotland and England, which of these nations gains from the other by this free commerce? Or if the former kingdom has received any increase of riches, can it reasonably be accounted for by any thing but the increase of its art and industry? It was a common apprehension in England, before the Union, as we learn from L'Abbe du Bois, [Les Interest d'Angleterre mal-entendus] that Scotland would soon drain them of their treasure, were an open trade allowed; and on the other side of the Tweed a contrary apprehension prevailed: with what justice in both time has shown.

What happens in small portions of mankind must take place in greater. The provinces of the Roman empire, no doubt, kept their balance with each other, and with Italy, independent of the legislature, as much as the several counties of Great Britain, or the several parishes of each county. And any man who travels over Europe at this day, may see, by the prices of commodities, that money, in spite of the absurd jealousy of princes and states, has brought itself nearly to a level, and that the difference between one kingdom and another is not greater in this respect, than it is often between different provinces of the same kingdom. Men naturally flock to capital cities, sea-ports, and navigable rivers. There we find more men more industry, more commodities, and consequently more money, but still the latter difference holds proportion with the former, and the level is preserved.*

Our jealousy and our hatred of France are without bounds, and the former sentiment, at least, must be acknowledged reasonable and well-grounded. These passions have occasioned innumerable barriers and obstructions upon commerce, where we are accused of being commonly the aggressors. But what have we gained by the bargain! We lost the French market for our woollen manufactures, and transferred the commerce of wine to Spain and Portugal, where we buy worse liquor at a higher price. There are few Englishmen who would not think their country absolutely ruined, were French wines sold in England so cheap and in such abundance as to supplant, in some measure, all ale and home-brewed liquors: but would we lay aside prejudice, it would not be difficult to prove, that nothing could be more innocent, perhaps advantageous. Each new acre of vineyard planted in France, in order to supply England with wine, would make it requisite for the French to take the produce of an English acre, sown in wheat or barley, in order to subsist themselves; and it is evident that we should thereby get command of the better commodity.

There are many edicts of the French king, prohibiting the planting of new vineyards, and ordering all those which are lately planted to be grubbed up: so sensible are they, in that country, of the superior value of corn above every other product.

Mareschal Vauban complains often, and with reason, of the absurd duties which load the entry of those wines of Languedoc, Guienne, and

* It must carefully be remarked, that throughout this discourse, wherever I speak of the level of money, I mean always its proportional level to the commodities, labour, industry, and skill, which is in the several states. And I assert, that where these advantages are double, triple, quadruple, to what they are in the neighbouring states, the money infallibly will also be double, triple, and quadruple. The only circumstance that can obstruct the exactness of these proportions, is the expense of transporting the commodities from one place to another; and this expense is sometimes unequal. Thus the corn, cattle, cheese, butter of Derbyshire, cannot draw the money of London, so much as the manufactures of London draw the money of Derbyshire. But this objection is only a seeming one: for so far as the transport of commodities is expensive, so far is the communication between the places obstructed and imperfect.

other southern provinces, that are imported into Brittany and Normandy. He entertained no doubt but these latter provinces could preserve their balance, notwithstanding the open commerce which he recommends. And it is evident, that a few leagues more navigation to England would make no difference; or if it did, that it must operate alike on the commodities of both kingdoms.

There is indeed one expedient by which it is possible to sink, and another by which we may raise money beyond its natural level in any kingdom; but these cases, when examined, will be found to resolve into our general theory, and to bring additional authority to it.

I scarcely know any method of sinking money below its level, but those institutions of banks, funds, and paper credit, which are so much practised in this kingdom. These render paper equivalent to money, circulate it throughout the whole state, make it supply the place of gold and silver, raise proportionably the price of labour and commodities, and by that means either banish a great part of those precious metals, or prevent their farther increase. What can be more short-sighted than our reasonings on this head? We fancy because an individual would be much richer, were his stock of money doubled, that the same good effect would follow were the money of every one increased; not considering that this would raise as much the price of every commodity, and reduce every man in time to the same condition as before. It is only in our public negociations and transactions with foreigners, that a greater stock of money is advantageous; and as our paper is there absolutely insignificant, we feel, by its means, all the effects arising from a great abundance of money, without reaping any of the advantages.*

Suppose that there are 12 millions of paper, which circulate in the kingdom as money (for we are not to imagine that all our enormous funds are employed in that shape), and suppose the real cash of the kingdom to be 18 millions: here is a state which is found by experience to be able to hold a stock of 30 millions. I say, if it be able to hold it, it must of necessity have acquired it in gold and silver, had we not obstructed the entrance of these metals by this new invention of paper. *Whence would it have acquired that sum?* From all the kingdoms of the world. *But why?* Because, if you remove these 12 millions, money in this state is below its level, compared with our neighbours; and we must immediately draw from all of them, till we be full and saturate, so to speak, and can hold no more. By our present politics, we are as careful to stuff the nation with this fine commodity of bank-bills and chequer notes, as if we were afraid of being over-burthened with the precious metals.

*We observed in Essay 25, that money, when increasing, gives encouragement to industry, during the intervals between the increase of money and rise of the prices. A good effect of this nature may follow too from paper credit; but it is dangerous to precipitate matters, at the risk of losing all by the failing of that credit, as must happen upon any violent shock in public affairs.

It is not to be doubted, but the great plenty of bullion in France is, in a great measure, owing to the want of paper-credit. The French have no banks: merchant's bills do not there circulate as with us: usury, or lending on interest, is not directly permitted; so that many have large sums in their coffers: great quantities of plate are used in private houses; and all the churches are full of it. By this means, provisions and labour still remain cheaper among them, than in nations that are not half so rich in gold and silver. The advantages of this situation, in point of trade, as well as in great public emergencies, are too evident to be disputed.

The same fashion a few years ago prevailed in Genoa, which still has place in England and Holland, of using services of China-ware instead of plate; but the senate, forseeing the consequence, prohibited the use of that brittle commodity beyond a certain extent; while the use of silver-plate was left unlimited. And I suppose, in their late distresses, they felt the good effect of this ordinance. Our tax on plate is, perhaps, in this view, somewhat impolitic.

Before the introduction of paper-money into our colonies, they had gold and silver sufficient for their circulation. Since the introduction of that commodity, the least inconveniency that has followed is the total banishment of the precious metals. And after the abolition of paper, can it be doubted but money will return, while these colonies possess manufactures and commodities, the only thing valuable in commerce, and for whose sake alone all men desire money?

What a pity Lycurgus did not think of paper credit, when he wanted to banish gold and silver from Sparta! It would have served his purpose better than the lumps of iron he made use of as money; and would also have prevented more effectually all commerce with strangers, as being of so much less real and intrinsic value.

It must, however, be confessed, that, as all these questions of trade and money are extremely complicated, there are certain lights, in which this subject may be placed, so as to represent the advantages of paper-credit and banks to be superior to their disadvantages. That they banish specie and bullion from a state, is undoubtedly true; and whoever looks no farther than this circumstance, does well to condemn them; but specie and bullion are not of so great consequence as not to admit of a compensation, and even an overbalance from the increase of industry and of credit, which may be promoted by the right use of paper-money. It is well known of what advantage it is to a merchant to be able to discount his bills upon occasion; and every thing that facilitates this species of traffic is favourable to the general commerce of a state. But private bankers are enabled to give such credit by the credit they receive from the depositing of money in their shops; and the bank of England in the same manner, from the liberty it has to issue its notes in all payments. There was an invention of this kind,

which was fallen upon some years ago by the banks of Edinburgh; and which, as it is one of the most ingenious ideas that has been executed in commerce, has also been thought advantageous to Scotland. It is there called a Bank-Credit, and is of this nature. A man goes to the bank and finds surety to the amount, we shall suppose, of a thousand pounds. This money, or any part of it, he has the liberty of drawing out whenever he pleases, and he pays only the ordinary interest for it while it is in his hands. He may, when he pleases, repay any sum so small as twenty pounds, and the interest is discounted from the very day of the repayment. The advantages, resulting from this contrivance, are manifold. As a man may find surety nearly to the amount of his substance, and his bank credit is equivalent to ready money, a merchant does hereby in a manner coin his houses, his household-furniture, the goods in his warehouse, the foreign debts due to him, his ships at sea; and can, upon occasion, employ them in all payments, as if they were the current money of the country. If a man borrow a thousand pounds from a private hand, besides that it is not always to be found when required, he pays interest for it, whether he be using it or not: his bank-credit costs him nothing except during the very moment in which it is of service to him: and this circumstance is of equal advantage as if he had borrowed money at much lower interest. Merchants, likewise, from this invention, acquire a great facility in supporting each other's credit, which is a considerable security against bankruptcies. A man, when his own bank-credit is exhausted, goes to any of his neighbours who is not in the same condition; and he gets the money, which he replaces at his convenience.

After this practice had taken place during some years at Edinburgh, several companies of merchants at Glasgow carried the matter further. They associated themselves into different banks, and issued notes so low as ten shillings, which they used in all payments for goods, manufactures, tradesmen's labour of all kinds; and these notes, from the established credit of the companies, passed as money in all payments throughout the country. By this means, a stock of five thousand pounds was able to perform the same operations as if it were six or seven; and merchants were thereby enabled to trade to a greater extent, and to require less profit in all their transactions. But whatever other advantages result from these inventions, it must still be allowed that, besides giving too great facility for credit, which is dangerous, they banish the precious metals: and nothing can be a more evident proof of it, than a comparison of the past and present condition of Scotland in that particular. It was found, upon the recoinage made after the union, that there was near a million of specie in that country: but notwithstanding the great increase of riches, commerce, and manufactures of all kinds, it is thought that, even where there is

no extraordinary drain made by England, the current specie will not now amount to a third of that sum.

But as our projects of paper-credit are almost the only expedient, by which we can sink money below its level; so, in my opinion, the only expedient, by which we can raise money above it, is a practice which we should all exclaim against, as destructive, namely, the gathering of large sums into a public treasure, locking them up, and absolutely preventing their circulation. The fluid, not communicating with the neighbouring element, may, by such an artifice, be raised to what height we please. To prove this, we need only return to our first supposition, of annihilating the half or any part of our cash; where we found, that the immediate consequence of such an event would be the attraction of an equal sum from all the neighbouring kingdoms. Nor does there seem to be any necessary bounds set, by the nature of things, to this practice of hoarding. A small city, like Geneva, continuing this policy for ages, might engross nine tenths of the money in Europe. There seems, indeed, in the nature of man, an invincible obstacle to that immense growth of riches. A weak state, with an enormous treasure, will soon become a prey to some of its poorer, but more powerful neighbours. A great state would dissipate its wealth in dangerous and ill-concerted projects; and probably destroy, with it, what is much more valuable, the industry, morals, and numbers of its people. The fluid, in this case, raised to too great a height, bursts and destroys the vessel that contains it; and mixing itself with the surrounding elements, soon falls to its proper level.

So little are we commonly acquainted with this principle, that, though all historians agree in relating uniformly so recent an event, as the immense treasure amassed by Harry VII. (which they make amount to 2,700,000 pounds), we rather reject their concurring testimony, than admit of a fact, which agrees so ill with our inveterate prejudices. It is indeed probable, that this sum might be three-fourths of all the money in England. But where is the difficulty in conceiving that such a sum might be amassed in twenty years, by a cunning, rapacious, frugal, and almost absolute monarch? Nor is it probable, that the diminution of circulating money was ever sensibly felt by the people, or ever did them any prejudice. The sinking of the prices of all commodities would immediately replace it, by giving England the advantage in its commerce with the neighbouring kingdoms.

Have we not an instance in the small republic of Athens with its allies, who, in about fifty years, between the Median and Peloponnesian wars, amassed a sum not much inferior to that of Harry VII.? For all the Greek historians [Thucydides, lib. ii. and Diod. Sic. lib. xii.] and orators [*Vid.* Æschinis *et* Demosthenis *Epist.*] agree, that the Athenians collected in the citadel more than 10,000 talents, which they afterwards dissipated to their own ruin, in rash and imprudent

enterprizes. But when this money was set a running, and began to communicate with the surrounding fluid, what was the consequence? Did it remain in the state? No For we find, by the memorable *census* mentioned by Demosthenes [Περι Συμμοριας], and Polybius [Lib ii cap 62], that, in about fifty years afterwards, the whole value of the republic, comprehending lands, houses, commodities, slaves, and money, was less than 6000 talents

What an ambitious high-spirited people was this, to collect and keep in their treasury, with a view to conquests, a sum, which it was every day in the power of the citizens, by a single vote, to distribute among themselves, and which would have gone near to triple the riches of every individual! For we must observe, that the numbers and private riches of the Athenians are said, by ancient writers, to have been no greater at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, than at the beginning of the Macedonian

Money was little more plentiful in Greece during the age of Philip and Perseus, than in England during that of Harry VII yet these two monarchs in thirty years [Titi Livii, lib xlv cap 40], collected from the small kingdom of Macedon, a larger treasure than that of the English monarch Paulus Æmilius brought to Rome about 1,700,000 pounds *Ster* [Vel Paterc lib i cap 9.] Pliny says, 2,400,000. [Lib xxxiii cap 3] And that was but a part of the Macedonian treasure The rest was dissipated by the resistance and flight of Perseus [Titi Livii *ibid*]

We may learn from Stanian, that the canton of Berne had 300,000 pounds lent at interest, and had about six times as much in their treasury Here then is a sum hoarded of 1 800,000 pounds *Sterling*, which is at least quadruple what should naturally circulate in such a petty state, and yet no one, who travels in the Pais de Vaux, or any part of that canton, observes any want of money more than could be supposed in a country of that extent, soil, and situation On the contrary, there are scarce any inland provinces in the continent of France or Germany, where the inhabitants are at this time so opulent, though that canton has vastly increased its treasure since 1714, the time when Stanian wrote his judicious account of Switzerland.*

The account given by Appian [Proem] of the treasure of the Ptolemies, is so prodigious, that one cannot admit of it, and so much the less, because the historian says, that the other successors of Alexander were also frugal, and had many of them treasures not much inferior. For this saving humour of the neighbouring princes must necessarily have checked the frugality of the Egyptian monarchs,

* The poverty which Stanian speaks of is only to be seen in the most mountainous cantons where there is no commodity to bring money And even there the people are not poorer than in the diocese of Saltzburg on the one hand or Savoy on the other

according to the foregoing theory The sum he mentions is 740,000 talents, or 191,166,666 pounds 13 shillings and 4 pence, according to Dr Arbuthnot's computation And yet Appian says, that he extracted his account from the public records, and he was himself a native of Alexandria

From these principles we may learn what judgment we ought to form of those numberless bars, obstructions, and imposts, which all nations of Europe, and none more than England, have put upon trade, from an exorbitant desire of amassing money, which never will heap up beyond its level, while it circulates, or from an ill-grounded apprehension of losing their specie, which never will sink below it. Could anything scatter our riches, it would be such impolitic contrivances. But this general ill effect, however, results from them, that they deprive neighbouring nations of that free communication and exchange which the Author of the world has intended, by giving them soils, climates, and geniuses, so different from each other

Our modern politics embrace the only method of banishing money, the using of paper-credit, they reject the only method of amassing it, the practice of hoarding, and they adopt a hundred contrivances, which serve to no purpose but to check industry and to rob ourselves and our neighbours of the common benefits of art and nature.

All taxes, however, upon foreign commodities, are not to be regarded as prejudicial or useless, but those only which are founded on the jealousy above-mentioned A tax on German linen encourages home manufactures, and thereby multiplies our people and industry A tax on brandy increases the sale of rum, and supports our southern colonies. And as it is necessary, that imposts should be levied for the support of government, it may be thought more convenient to lay them on foreign commodities, which can easily be intercepted at the port, and subjected to the impost We ought, however, always to remember the maxim of Dr Swift, that, in the arithmetic of the customs, two and two make not four, but often make only one It can scarcely be doubted, but if the duties on wine were lowered to a third, they would yield much more to the government than at present our people might therefore afford to drink commonly a better and more wholesome liquor, and no prejudice would ensue to the balance of trade, of which we are so jealous The manufacture of ale beyond the agriculture is but inconsiderable, and gives employment to few hands. The transport of wine and corn would not be much inferior

But are there not frequent instances, you will say, of states and kingdoms, which were formerly rich and opulent, and are now poor and beggarly? Has not the money left them, with which they formerly abounded? I answer, if they lose their trade, industry, and people, they cannot expect to keep their gold and silver for these precious metals will hold proportion to the former advantages. When Lisbon

and Amsterdam got the East-India trade from Venice and Genoa, they also got the profits and money which arose from it. Where the seat of government is transferred, where expensive armies are maintained at a distance, where great funds are possessed by foreigners, there naturally follows from these causes a diminution of the specie But these, we may observe, are violent and forcible methods of carrying away money, and are in time commonly attended with the transport of people and industry But where these remain, and the drain is not continued, the money always finds its way back again, by a hundred canals, of which we have no notion or suspicion What immense treasures have been spent, by so many nations, in Flanders, since the revolution, in the course of three long years? More money perhaps than the half of what is at present in Europe But what has now become of it? Is it in the narrow compass of the Austrian provinces? No, surely it has most of it returned to the several countries whence it came, and has followed that art and industry, by which at first it was acquired For above a thousand years, the money of Europe has been flowing to Rome, by an open and sensible current, but it has been emptied by many secret and insensible canals and the want of industry and commerce renders at present the papal dominions the poorest territory in all Italy

In short, a government has great reason to preserve with care its people and its manufactures Its money it may safely trust to the course of human affairs, without fear or jealousy Or, if it ever give attention to this latter circumstance, it ought only to be so far as it affects the former.

XXVIII - OF THE JEALOUSY OF TRADE.

HAVING endeavoured to remove one species of ill-founded jealousy, which is so prevalent among commercial nations, it may not be amiss to mention another, which seems equally groundless. Nothing is more usual, among states which have made some advances in commerce, than to look on the progress of their neighbours with a suspicious eye, to consider all trading states as their rivals, and to suppose that it is impossible for any of them to flourish, but at their expense. In opposition to this narrow and malignant opinion, I will venture to assert, that the increase of riches and commerce in any one nation, instead of hurting, commonly promotes the riches and commerce of all its neighbours, and that a state can scarcely carry its trade and industry very far, where all the surrounding states are buried in ignorance, sloth, and barbarism.

It is obvious, that the domestic industry of a people cannot be hurt by the greatest prosperity of their neighbours; and as this branch of commerce is undoubtedly the most important in any extensive kingdom, we are so far removed from all reason of jealousy. But I go farther, and observe, that where an open communication is preserved among nations, it is impossible but the domestic industry of every one must receive an increase from the improvements of the others. Compare the situation of Great Britain at present, with what it was two centuries ago. All the arts, both of agriculture and manufactures, were extremely rude and imperfect. Every improvement, which we have since made, has arisen from our imitation of foreigners; and we ought so far to esteem it happy, that they had previously made advances in arts and ingenuity. But this intercourse is still upheld to our advantage: notwithstanding the advanced state of our manufactures, we daily adopt, in every art, the inventions and improvements of our neighbours. The commodity is first imported from abroad, to our great discontent, while we imagine that it drains us of our money: afterwards, the art itself is gradually imported, to our visible advantage: yet we continue still to repine, that our neighbours should possess any art, industry, and invention; forgetting that, had they not first instructed us, we should have been at present barbarians; and did they not still continue their instructions, the arts must fall into a state of languor, and lose that emulation and novelty which contribute so much to their advancement.

The increase of domestic industry lays the foundation of foreign commerce. Where a great number of commodities are raised and perfected for the home market, there will always be found some which can be exported with advantage. But if our neighbours have no art or cultivation, they cannot take them; because they will have nothing to give in exchange. In this respect, states are in the same condition as individuals. A single man can scarcely be industrious, where all his fellow citizens are idle. The riches of the several members of a community contribute to increase my riches, whatever profession I may follow. They consume the produce of my industry, and afford me the produce of theirs in return.

Nor needs any state entertain apprehensions, that their neighbours will improve to such a degree in every art and manufacture, as to have no demand from them. Nature, by giving a diversity of geniuses, climates, and soils to different nations, has secured their mutual intercourse and commerce, as long as they all remain industrious and civilized. Nay, the more the arts increase in any state, the more will be its demands from its industrious neighbours. The inhabitants, having become opulent and skilful, desire to have every commodity in the utmost perfection; and as they have plenty of commodities to give in exchange, they make large importations from every foreign country.

ons, from whom they import, receives encou-
lso increased, by the sale of the commodities
nge
is any staple commodity, such as the woollen
and? Must not the interfering of our neigh
e be a loss to us? I answer, that, when any
ed the staple of a kingdom it is supposed that
eculiar and natural advantages for raising the
ithstanding these advantages, they lose such
t to blame their own idleness, or bad govern-
f their neighbours It ought also to be con-
rease of industry among the neighbouring
of every particular species of commodity is
igh foreign manufactures interfere with them
d for their product may still continue, or even
it diminish, ought the consequence to be
he spirit of industry be preserved, it may
ne branch to another, and the manufacturers
employed in linen, silk, iron, or any other
iere appears to be a demand We need not
objects of industry will be exhausted, or that
they remain on an equal footing with those
be in danger of wanting employment The
itions serves rather to keep industry alive in
ple is happier who possess a variety of manu-
joyed one single great manufacture, in which
Their situation is less precarious and they
ose revolutions and uncertainties, to which
of commerce will always be exposed
state that ought to dread the improvements
ighbours, is such a one as the Dutch, who,
a, nor possessing any number of native com-
y their being the brokers, and factors and
a people may naturally apprehend, that as
ng states come to know and pursue their
o their own hands the management of their
r brokers of that profit which the formerly
hough this consequence may naturally be
before it takes place, and by art and indus-
for many generations, if not wholly eluded
r stocks and correspondence is so great, that
, and as all the transactions increase by the
he neighbouring states, even a people whose
s precarious basis, may at first reap a consi-
ourishing condition of their neighbours. The

Dutch, having mortgaged all their revenues, make not such a figure in political transactions as formerly, but their commerce is surely equal to what it was in the middle of the last century, when they were reckoned among the great powers of Europe

Were our narrow and malignant politics to meet with success, we should reduce all our neighbouring nations to the same state of sloth and ignorance that prevails in Morocco and the coast of Barbary But what would be the consequence? They could send us no commodities they could take none from us our domestic commerce itself would languish for want of emulation, example, and instruction and we ourselves should soon fall into the same abject condition, to which we had reduced them I shall therefore venture to acknowledge, that, not only as a man, but as a British subject, I pray for the flourishing commerce of Germany, Spain, Italy, and even France itself I am at least certain that Great Britain, and all those nations, would flourish more, did their sovereigns and their ministers adopt such enlarged and benevolent sentiments towards each other

---

XXIX—OF THE BALANCE OF POWER.

IT is a question whether the *idea* of the balance of power be owing entirely to modern policy, or whether the *phrase* only has been invented in the later ages? It is certain that Xenophon [Lib i] in his Institution of Cyrus, represents the combination of the Asiatic powers to have arisen from a jealousy of the increasing force of the Medes and Persians and though that elegant composition should be supposed altogether a romance, this sentiment, ascribed by the author to the Eastern princes, is at least a proof of the prevailing notion of ancient times

In all the politics of Greece, the anxiety, with regard to the balance of power, is apparent, and is expressly pointed out to us, even by the ancient historians Thucydides [Lib i] represents the league which was formed against Athens, and which produced the Peloponnesian war, as entirely owing to this principle And after the decline of Athens, when the Thebans and Lacedemonians disputed for sovereignty, we find that the Athenians (as well as many other republics) always threw themselves into the lighter scale, and endeavoured to preserve the balance They supported Thebes against Sparta, till the great victory gained by Epaminondas at Leuctra, after which they immediately went over to the conquered, from generosity, as they pretended, but in reality from their jealousy of the conquerors. [Xenoph. Hist. Græc lib vi. and vii.]

Whoever will read Demosthenes's oration for the Megalopolitans, may see the utmost refinements on this principle, that ever entered into the head of a Venetian or English speculatist And upon the first rise of the Macedonian power, this orator immediately discovered the danger, sounded the alarm throughout all Greece, and at last assembled that confederacy under the banners of Athens, which fought the great and decisive battle of Chaeronea

It is true, the Grecian wars are regarded by historians as wars of emulation rather than of politics, and each state seems to have had more in view the honour of leading the rest, than any well-grounded hopes of authority and dominion If we consider, indeed, the small number of inhabitants in any one republic, compared to the whole, the great difficulty of forming sieges in those times, and the extraordinary bravery and discipline of every freeman among that noble people, we shall conclude, that the balance of power was, of itself, sufficiently secured in Greece, and need not to have been guarded with that caution which may be requisite in other ages But whether we ascribe the shifting of sides in all the Grecian republics to *jealous emulation* or *cautious politics*, the effects were alike, and every prevailing power was sure to meet with a confederacy against it, and that often composed of its former friends and allies

The same principle, call it envy or prudence, which produced the *Ostracism* of Athens, and *Petalism* of Syracuse, and expelled every citizen whose fame or power overtopped the rest, the same principle, I say, naturally discovered itself in foreign politics, and soon raised enemies to the leading state however moderate in the exercise of its authority

The Persian monarch was really, in his force, a petty prince compared to the Grecian republics, and therefore it behoved him, from views of safety more than from emulation, to interest himself in their quarrels, and to support the weaker side in every contest This was the advice given by Alcibiades to Tissaphernes [Thucyd lib viii] and it prolonged, near a century, the date of the Persian empire, till the neglect of it for a moment, after the first appearance of the aspiring genius of Philip, brought that lofty and frail edifice to the ground, with a rapidity of which there are few instances in the history of mankind

The successors of Alexander showed great jealousy of the balance of power; a jealousy founded on true politics and prudence, and which preserved distinct for several ages the partition made after the death of that famous conqueror The fortune and ambition of Antigonus [Diod. Sic lib. xx] threatened them anew with a universal monarchy, but their combination, and their victory at Ipsus, saved them. And in subsequent times, we find, that, as the Eastern princes considered the Greeks and Macedonians as the only real military

force with whom they had any intercourse, they kept always a watchful eye over that part of the world The Ptolemies, in particular, supported first Aratus and the Achæans, and then Cleomenes king of Sparta, from no other view than as a counterbalance to the Macedonian monarchs For this is the account which Polybus gives of the Egyptian politics [Lib ii cap 51]

The reason why it is supposed that the ancients were entirely ignorant of the *balance of power*, seems to be drawn from the Roman history more than the Grecian , and as the transactions of the forme are generally more familiar to us, we have thence formed all our conclusions It must be owned, that the Romans never met with any such general combination or confederacy against them, as might naturally have been expected for their rapid conquests and declared ambition, but were allowed peaceably to subdue their neighbours, one after another, till they extended their dominion over the whole known world Not to mention the fabulous history of their Italic wars, there was, upon Hannibal's invasion of the Roman state, a remarkable crisis, which ought to have called up the attention of all civilized nations It appeared afterwards (nor was it difficult to be observed at the time) * that this was a contest for universal empire , yet no prince or state seems to have been in the least alarmed about the event or issue of the quarrel Philip of Macedon remained neuter, till he saw the victories of Hannibal , and then most imprudently formed an alliance with the conqueror, upon terms still more imprudent He stipulated, that he was to assist the Carthaginian state in their conquest of Italy , after which they engaged to send over forces into Greece, to assist him in subduing the Grecian commonwealth [Tit Livii, lib xxiii cap 33]

The Rhodian and Achæan republics are much celebrated by ancient historians for their wisdom and sound policy , yet both of them assisted the Romans in their wars against Philip and Antiochus And what may be esteemed still a stronger proof, that this maxim was not generally known in those ages, no ancient author has remarked the imprudence of these measures, nor has even blamed that absurd treaty above-mentioned, made by Philip with the Carthaginians. Princes and statesmen, in all ages, may, beforehand, be blinded in their reasonings with regard to events but it is somewhat extraordinary, that historians, afterwards, should not form a sounder judgment of them

Massinissa, Attalus, Prusias, in gratifying their private passions, were all of them the instruments of the Roman greatness, and never seem to have suspected, that they were forging their own chains, while they advanced the conquests of their ally A simple treaty and agreement between Massinissa and the Carthaginians, so much

* It was observed by some, as appears by the speech of Agesilaus of Naupactum, in the general congress of Greece See Polyb lib v cap 104.

required by mutual interest, barred the Romans from all entrance into Africa, and preserved liberty to mankind.

The only prince we meet with in the Roman history, who seems to have understood the balance of power, is Hiero, king of Syracuse. Though the ally of Rome, he sent assistance to the Carthaginians during the war of the auxiliaries, 'Esteeming it requisite,' says Polybius, [Lib. 1. cap. 83.] both in order to retain his dominions in Sicily, 'and to preserve the Roman friendship, that Carthage should be safe; 'lest by its fall the remaining power should be able, without contrast 'or opposition, to execute every purpose and undertaking. And here 'he acted with great wisdom and prudence: for that is never, on 'any account, to be overlooked; nor ought such a force ever to be 'thrown into one hand, as to incapacitate the neighbouring states 'from defending their rights against it.' Here is the aim of modern politics pointed out in express terms.

In short, the maxim of preserving the balance of power is founded so much on common sense and obvious reasoning, that it is impossible it could altogether have escaped antiquity, where we find, in other particulars, so many marks of deep penetration and discernment. If it was not so generally known and acknowledged as at present, it had at least an influence on all the wiser and more experienced princes and politicians. And indeed, even at present, however generally known and acknowledged among speculative reasoners, it has not, in practice, an authority much more extensive among those who govern the world.

After the fall of the Roman empire, the form of government, established by the northern conquerors, incapacitated them, in a great measure, for farther conquests, and long maintained each state in its proper boundaries. But when vassalage and the feudal militia were abolished, mankind were anew alarmed by the danger of universal monarchy, from the union of so many kingdoms and principalities in the person of the Emperor Charles. But the power of the house of Austria, founded on extensive but divided dominions, and their riches, derived chiefly from mines of gold and silver, were more likely to decay, of themselves, from internal defects, than to overthrow all the bulwarks raised against them. In less than a century, the force of that violent and haughty race was shattered, their opulence dissipated, their splendor eclipsed. A new power succeeded, more formidable to the liberties of Europe, possessing all the advantages of the former, and labouring under none of its defects, except a share of that spirit of bigotry and persecution, with which the house of Austria was so long, and still is so much infatuated.

In the general wars maintained against this ambitious power, Great Britain has stood foremost, and she still maintains her station. Beside her advantages of riches and situation, her people are animated with

such a national spirit, and are so fully sensible of the blessings of their government, that we may hope their vigour never will languish in so necessary and so just a cause. On the contrary, if we may judge by the past, their passionate ardour seems rather to require some moderation; and they have more often erred from a laudable excess than from a blameable deficiency.

I. We seem to have been more possessed with the ancient Greek spirit of jealous emulation, than actuated by the prudent views of modern politics. Our wars with France have been begun with justice, and even perhaps from necessity, but have always been too far pushed, from obstinacy and passion. The same peace, which was afterwards made at Ryswick in 1697, was offered so early as the year 1692; that concluded at Utrecht in 1712 might have been finished on as good conditions at Gertruytenberg in 1708; and we might have given at Frankfort, in 1743, the same terms which we were glad to accept of at Aix-la-Chapelle in the year 1748. Here then we see, that above half of our wars with France, and all our public debts, are owing more to our own imprudent vehemence, than to the ambition of our neighbours.

II. We are so declared in our opposition to French power, and so alert in defence of our allies, that they always reckon upon our force as upon their own; and expecting to carry on war at our expense, refuse all reasonable terms of accommodation. *Habent subjectos, tanquam suos; viles, ut alienos.* All the world knows, that the factious vote of the House of Commons, in the beginning of the last parliament, with the professed humour of the nation, made the Queen of Hungary inflexible in her terms, and prevented that agreement with Prussia, which would immediately have restored the general tranquillity of Europe.

III. We are such true combatants, that, when once engaged, we lose all concern for ourselves and our posterity, and consider only how we may best annoy the enemy. To mortgage our revenues at so deep a rate in wars where we were only accessories, was surely the most fatal delusion, that a nation, which had any pretensions to politics and prudence, has ever yet been guilty of. That remedy of funding, if it be a remedy, and not rather a poison, ought, in all reason, to be reserved to the last extremity; and no evil, but the greatest and most urgent, should ever induce us to embrace so dangerous an expedient.

These excesses, to which we have been carried, are prejudicial, and may, perhaps, in time, become still more prejudicial another way, by begetting, as is usual, the opposite extreme, and rendering us totally careless and supine with regard to the fate of Europe. The Athenians, from the most bustling, intriguing, warlike, people of Greece, finding their error in thrusting themselves into every quarrel, abandoned all

attention to foreign affairs, and in no contest ever took part on either side, except by their flatteries and complaisance to the victor

Enormous monarchies are, probably, destructive to human nature, in their progress, in their continuance*, and even in their downfall, which never can be very distant from their establishment. The military genius, which aggrandized the monarchy, soon leaves the court, the capital, and the centre of such a government while the wars are carried on at a great distance, and interest so small a part of the state. The ancient nobility, whose affections attach them to their sovereign, live all at court, and never will accept of military employments, which would carry them to remote and barbarous frontiers, where they are distant both from their pleasures and their fortune. The arms of the state must therefore be entrusted to mercenary strangers, without zeal, without attachment, without honour, ready on every occasion to turn them against the prince, and join each desperate malcontent who offers pay and plunder. This is the necessary progress of human affairs thus human nature checks itself in its airy elevation, thus ambition blindly labours for the destruction of the conqueror, of his family, and of every thing near and dear to him. The Bourbons, trusting to the support of their brave, faithful, and affectionate nobility, would push their advantage without reserve or limitation. These, while fired with glory and emulation, can bear the fatigues and dangers of war, but never would submit to languish in the garrison of Hungary or Lithuania, forgot at court, and sacrificed to the intrigues of every minion or mistress who approaches the prince. The troops are filled with Cravates and Tartars, Hussars and Cossacks, intermingled, perhaps, with a few soldiers of fortune from the better provinces and the melancholy fate of the Roman emperors, from the same cause, is renewed over and over again, till the final dissolution of the monarchy

---

XXX.—OF TAXES

THERE is a prevailing maxim among some reasoners, *that every new tax creates a new ability in the subject to bear it, and that each increase of public burdens increases proportionably the industry of the people.* This maxim is of such a nature as is most likely to be abused, and is so much the more dangerous, as its truth cannot be altogether denied:

* If the Roman empire was of advantage it could only proceed from this, that mankind were generally in a very disorderly, uncivilized condition, before its establishment.

but it must be owned, when kept within certain bounds, to have some foundation in reason and experience.

When a tax is laid upon commodities which are consumed by the common people, the necessary consequence may seem to be, either that the poor must retrench something from their way of living, or raise their wages, so as to make the burden of the tax fall entirely upon the rich. But there is a third consequence, which often follows upon taxes, namely, that the poor increase their industry, perform more work, and live as well as before, without demanding more for their labour. Where taxes are moderate, are laid on gradually, and affect not the necessaries of life, this consequence naturally follows; and it is certain, that such difficulties often serve to excite the industry of a people, and render them more opulent and laborious, than others, who enjoy the greatest advantages. For we may observe, as a parallel instance, that the most commercial nations have not always possessed the greatest extent of fertile land; but on the contrary, that they have laboured under many natural disadvantages. Tyre, Athens, Carthage, Rhodes, Genoa, Venice, Holland, are strong examples to this purpose. And in all history, we find only three instances of large and fertile countries, which have possessed much trade; the Netherlands, England, and France. The two former seem to have been allured by the advantages of their maritime situation, and the necessity they lay under of frequenting foreign ports, in order to procure what their own climate refused them. And as to France, trade has come late into that kingdom, and seems to have been the effect of reflection and observation in an ingenious and enterprizing people, who remarked the riches acquired by such of the neighbouring nations as cultivated navigation and commerce.

The places mentioned by Cicero [Epist. ad Att. lib. ix. ep. 11.] as possessed of the greatest commerce in his time, are Alexandria, Colchos, Tyre, Sidon, Andros, Cyprus, Pamphylia, Lycia, Rhodes, Chios, Byzantium, Lesbos, Smyrna, Miletum, Coos. All these, except Alexandria, were either small islands, or narrow territories. And that city owed its trade entirely to the happiness of its situation.

Since therefore some natural necessities or disadvantages may be thought favourable to industry, why may not artificial burdens have the same effect? Sir William Temple*, we may observe, ascribes the industry of the Dutch entirely to necessity, proceeding from their natural disadvantages; and illustrates his doctrine by a striking comparison with Ireland; 'where,' says he, 'by the largeness and plenty of the soil, and scarcity of people, all things necessary to life are so cheap, that an industrious man, by two days labour, may gain enough to feed him the rest of the week. Which I take to be a very plain

* Account of the Netherlands, chap. 6.

ground of the laziness attributed to the people. For men naturally prefer ease before labour, and will not take pains if they can live idle; though when, by necessity, they have been inured to it, they cannot leave it, being grown a custom necessary to their health, and to their very entertainment. Nor perhaps is the change harder, from constant ease to labour, than from constant labour to ease.' After which the author proceeds to confirm his doctrine, by enumerating, as above, the places where trade has most flourished in ancient and modern times; and which are commonly observed to be such narrow confined territories, as beget a necessity for industry.

The best taxes are such as are levied upon consumptions, especially those of luxury; because such taxes are least felt by the people. They seem, in some measure, voluntary; since a man may chuse how far he will use the commodity which is taxed: they are paid gradually and insensibly: they naturally produce sobriety and frugality, if judiciously imposed: and being confounded with the natural price of the commodity, they are scarcely perceived by the consumers. Their only disadvantage is, that they are expensive in the levying.

Taxes upon possessions are levied without expense; but have every other disadvantage. Most states, however, are obliged to have recourse to them, in order to supply the deficiencies of the other.

But the most pernicious of all taxes are the arbitrary. They are commonly converted, by their management into punishments on industry; and also, by their unavoidable inequality, are more grievous, than by the real burden which they impose. It is surprising, therefore to see them have place among any civilized people.

In general, all poll taxes, even when not arbitrary, which they commonly are, may be esteemed dangerous: because it is so easy for the sovereign to add a little more, and a little more, to the sum demanded, that these taxes are apt to become altogether oppressive and intolerable. On the other hand, a duty upon commodities checks itself; and a prince will soon find, that an increase of the impost is no increase of his revenue. It is not easy, therefore, for a people to be altogether ruined by such taxes.

Historians inform us, that one of the chief causes of the destruction of the Roman state, was the alteration which Constantine introduced into the finances, by substituting an universal poll tax, in lieu of almost all the tithes, customs, and excises, which formerly composed the revenue of the *empire*. The people, in all the provinces, were so grinded and oppressed by the *publicans*, that they were glad to take refuge under the conquering arms of the barbarians; whose dominion, as they had fewer necessities and less art, was found preferable to the refined tyranny of the Romans.

It is an opinion, zealously promoted by some political writers, that, since all taxes, as they pretend, fall ultimately upon land, it were better

to lay them originally there, and abolish every duty upon consumptions. But it is denied, that all taxes fall ultimately upon land. If a duty be laid upon any commodity, consumed by an artizan, he has two obvious expedients for paying it; he may retrench somewhat of his expense, or he may increase his labour. Both these resources are more easy and natural, than that of heightening his wages. We see, that, in years of scarcity, the weaver either consumes less or labours more, or employs both these expedients of frugality and industry, by which he is enabled to reach the end of the year. It is but just that he should subject himself to the same hardships, if they deserve the name, for the sake of the public which gives him protection. By what contrivance can he raise the price of his labour? The manufacturer who employs him, will not give him more: neither can he, because the merchant, who exports the cloth, cannot raise its price, being limited by the price which it yields in foreign markets. Every man to be sure, is desirous of pushing off from himself the burden of any tax which is imposed, and of laying it upon others: but as every man has the same inclination, and is upon the defensive; no set of men can be supposed to prevail altogether in this contest. And why the landed gentleman should be the victim of the whole, and should not be able to defend himself, as well as others are, I cannot readily imagine. All tradesmen, indeed, would willingly prey upon him, and divide him among them, if they could: but this inclination they always have, though no taxes were levied; and the same methods by which he guards against the imposition of tradesmen before taxes, will serve him afterwards, and make them share the burden with him. They must be very heavy taxes, indeed, and very injudiciously levied which the artizan will not, of himself, be enabled to pay by superior industry and frugality, without raising the price of his labour.

I shall conclude this subject with observing, that we have, with regard to taxes, an instance of what frequently happens in political institutions, that the consequences of things are diametrically opposite to what we should expect on the first appearance. It is regarded as a fundamental maxim of the Turkish government, that the *Grand Signior*, though absolute master of the lives and fortunes of each individual, has no authority to impose a new tax: and every Ottoman prince, who has made such an attempt, either has been obliged to retract, or has found the fatal effects of his perseverance. One would imagine, that this prejudice or established opinion were the firmest barrier in the world against oppression; yet it is certain that its effect is quite contrary. The emperor, having no regular method of increasing his revenue, must allow all the bashaws and governors to oppress and abuse the subjects: and these he squeezes after their return from their government. Whereas, if he could impose a new tax, like our

European princes, his interest would so far be united with that of his people, that he would immediately feel the bad effects of these disorderly levies of money, and would find, that a pound, raised by a general imposition, would have less pernicious effects than a shilling taken in so unequal and arbitrary a manner.

XXXI.—OF PUBLIC CREDIT

It appears to have been the common practice of antiquity, to make provision, during peace, for the necessities of war, and to hoard up treasures before-hand as the instruments either of conquest or defence; without trusting to extraordinary impositions, much less to borrowing in times of disorder and confusion. Besides the immense sums above mentioned, [Essay 28.] which were amassed by Athens, and by the Ptolemies, and other successors of Alexander; we learn from Plato [Alcib.] that the frugal Lacedemonians had also collected a great treasure; and Arrian [Lib. iii.] and Plutarch* take no notice of the riches which Alexander got possession of on the possession of Susa and Ecbatana, and which were reserved, some of them, from the time of Cyrus. If I remember right, the Scripture also mentions the treasure of Hezekiah and the Jewish princes; as profane history does that of Philip and Perseus, kings of Macedon. The ancient republics of Gaul had commonly large sums in reserve [Strabo, lib. iv.]. Every one knows the treasure seized in Rome by Julius Cæsar, during the civil wars, and we find afterwards, that the wiser emperors, Augustus, Tiberius, Vespasian, Severus, &c., always discovered the prudent foresight, of saving great sums against any public exigency.

On the contrary, our modern expedient, which has become very general, is to mortgage the public revenues, and to trust that posterity will pay off the incumbrances contracted by their ancestors: and they, having before their eyes so good an example of their wise fathers, have the same prudent reliance on *their* posterity; who, at last, from necessity more than choice, are obliged to place the same confidence in a new posterity. But not to waste time in declaiming against a practice which appears ruinous, beyond all controversy; it seems pretty apparent, that the ancient maxims are, in this respect, more prudent than the modern; even though the latter had been confined within some reasonable bounds, and had ever, in any instance, been attended with such frugality, in time of peace, as to discharge the debts incurred by an expensive war. For why should the case be so different between the public and an individual, as to make us establish different maxims of conduct for

* Plut. in vita Alex. He makes these treasures amount to 80,000 talents, or about [illegible] sterling. Quintus Curtius (lib. v. cap. 2.) says, that Alexander found in Susa [illegible]

each? If the funds of the former be greater, its necessary expenses are proportionably larger; if its resources be more numerous, they are not infinite; and as its frame should be calculated for a much longer *duration than the date of a single life, or even of a family, it should* embrace maxims, large, durable, and generous, agreeably to the supposed extent of its existence. To trust to chances and temporary expedients, is, indeed, what the necessity of human affairs frequently renders unavoidable; but whoever voluntarily depend on such resources, have not necessity, but their own folly, to accuse for their misfortunes, when any such befal them.

If the abuses of treasures be dangerous, either by engaging the state in rash enterprises, or making it neglect military discipline, in confidence of its riches; the abuses of mortgaging are more certain and inevitable; poverty, impotence, and subjection to foreign powers.

According to modern policy, war is attended with every destructive circumstance; loss of men, increase of taxes, decay of commerce, dissipation of money, devastation by sea and land. According to ancient maxims, the opening of the public treasure, as it produced an uncommon affluence of gold and silver, served as a temporary encouragement to industry, and atoned, in some degree, for the inevitable calamities of war.

It is very tempting to a minister to employ such an expedient, as enables him to make a great figure during his administration, without overburthening the people with taxes, or exciting any immediate clamours against himself. The practice, therefore, of contracting debt, will almost infallibly be abused in every government. It would scarcely be more imprudent to give a prodigal son a credit in every banker's shop in London, than to empower a statesman to draw bills, in this manner, upon posterity.

What, then, shall we say to the new paradox, that public incumbrances are of themselves, advantageous independent of the necessity of contracting them; and, that any state, even though it were not pressed by a foreign enemy, could not possibly have embraced a wiser expedient for promoting commerce and riches, than to create funds, and debts, and taxes, without limitation? Reasonings, such as these, might naturally have passed for trials of wit among rhetoricians like the panegyrics on folly and a fever, on Busiris and Nero, had we not seen such absurd maxims patronized by great ministers, and by a whole party among us.

Let us examine the consequences of public debts, both in our domestic management, by their influence on commerce and industry; and in our foreign transactions, by their effect on wars and negotiations.

Public securities are with us become a kind of money, and pass as readily at the current price as gold or silver. Wherever any profitable

undertaking offers itself, how expensive soever, there are never wanting hands enow to embrace it, nor need a trader, who has sums in the public stocks, fear to launch out into the most extensive trade, since he is possessed of funds, which will answer the most sudden demand that can be made upon him. No merchant thinks it necessary to keep by him any considerable cash. Bank-stock, or India-bonds, especially the latter, serve all the same purposes, because he can dispose of them, or pledge them to a banker, in a quarter of an hour, and at the same time they are not idle, even when in his scrutoire, but bring him in a constant revenue. In short our national debts furnish merchants with a species of money that is continually multiplying in their hands, and produces sure gain, besides the profits of their commerce. This must enable them to trade upon less profit. The small profit of the merchant renders the commodity cheaper, causes a greater consumption, quickens the labour of the common people, and helps to spread arts and industry throughout the whole society.

There are also, we may observe, in England, and in all states which have both commerce and public debts, a set of men, who are half merchants, half stock-holders, and may be supposed willing to trade for small profits, because commerce is not their principal or sole support, and their revenues in the funds are a sure resource for themselves and their families. Were there no funds, great merchants would have no expedient for realising or securing any part of their profit, but by making purchases of land, and land has many disadvantages in comparison of funds. Requiring more care and inspection, it divides the time and attention of the merchant upon any tempting offer or extraordinary accident in trade. it is not so easily converted into money, and as it attracts too much, both by the many natural pleasures it affords, and the authority it gives, it soon converts the citizen into the country gentleman. More men, therefore with large stocks and incomes, may naturally be supposed to continue in trade, where there are public debts, and this, it must be owned, is of some advantage to commerce, by diminishing its profits promoting circulation, and encouraging industry.

But, in opposition to these two favourable circumstances, perhaps of no very great importance, weigh the many disadvantages which attend our public debts, in the whole *interior* economy of the state you will find no comparison between the ill and the good which result from them.

I. It is certain that national debts cause a mighty confluence of people and riches to the capital, by the great sums levied in the provinces to pay the interest, and perhaps, too, by the advantages in trade above mentioned, which they give the merchants in the capital above the rest of the kingdom. The question is, whether, in our case, it be for the public interest, that so many privileges should be

conferred on London, which has already arrived at such an enormous size, and seems still increasing? Some men are apprehensive of the consequences For my own part, I cannot forbear thinking, that, though the head is undoubtedly too large for the body, yet that great city is so happily situated, that its excessive bulk causes less inconvenience than even a smaller capital to a greater kingdom There is more difference between the prices of all provisions in Paris and Languedoc, than between those in London and Yorkshire The immense greatness, indeed, of London, under a government which admits not of discretionary power, renders the people factious, mutinous, seditious, and even perhaps rebellious But to this evil the national debts themselves tend to provide a remedy The first visible eruption or even immediate danger of public disorders, must alarm all the stockholders, whose property is the most precarious of any, and will make them fly to the support of government, whether menaced by Jacobitish violence, or democratical frenzy

II Public stocks, being a kind of paper-credit, have all the disadvantages attending that species of money They banish gold and silver from the most considerable commerce of the state, reduce them to common circulation, and by that means render all provisions and labour dearer than otherwise they would be

III The taxes, which are levied to pay the interests of these debts, are apt either to heighten the price of labour, or be an oppression on the poorer sort

IV As foreigners possess a great share of our national funds, they render the public, in a manner, tributary to them, and may in time occasion the transport of our people and our industry

V The greater part of the public stock being always in the hands of idle people, who live on their revenue, our funds, in that view, give great encouragement to an useless and inactive life

But though the injury, that arises to commerce and industry from our public funds, will appear, upon balancing the whole, not inconsiderable, it is trivial, in comparison of the prejudice that results to the state considered as a body politic, which must support itself in the society of nations, and have various transactions with other states in wars and negociations The ill there, is pure and unmixed, without any favourable circumstance to atone for it, and it is an ill too of a nature the highest and most important.

We have indeed been told, that the public is no weaker upon account of its debts, since they are mostly due among ourselves, and bring as much property to one as they take from another It is like transferring money from the right hand to the left, which leaves the person neither richer nor poorer than before Such loose reasonings and specious comparisons will always pass where we judge not upon principles. I ask, is it possible, in the nature of things, to [illegible]

them a nation with taxes, even where the sovereign resides among them? The very doubt seems extravagant, since it is requisite, in every community, that there be a certain proportion observed between the laborious and the idle part of it. But if all our present taxes be mortgaged, must we not invent new ones? And may not this matter be carried to a length that is ruinous and destructive?

In every nation, there are always some methods of levying money more easy than others, agreeably to the way of living of the people, and the commodities they make use of. In Great Britain, the excises upon malt and beer afford a large revenue, because the operations of malting and brewing are tedious, and are impossible to be concealed; and, at the same time, these commodities are not so absolutely necessary to life, as that the raising of their price would very much affect the poorer sort. These taxes being all mortgaged, what difficulty to find new ones! what vexation and ruin of the poor!

Duties upon consumptions are more equal and easy than those upon possessions. What a loss to the public, that the former are all exhausted, and that we must have recourse to the most grievous method of levying taxes!

Were all the proprietors of land only stewards to the public, must not necessity force them to practice all the arts of oppression used by stewards; where the absence or negligence of the proprietor render them secure against inquiry?

It will scarcely be asserted, that no bounds ought ever to be set to national debts, and that the public would be no weaker, were twelve or fifteen shillings in the pound, land-tax, mortgaged, with all the present customs and excises. There is something, therefore, in the case, beside the mere transferring of property from the one hand to another. In five hundred years, the posterity of those now in the coaches, and of those upon the boxes, will probably have changed places, without affecting the public by these revolutions.

Suppose the public once fairly brought to that condition, to which it is hastening with such amazing rapidity; suppose the land to be taxed eighteen or nineteen shillings in the pound; for it can never bear the whole twenty; suppose all the excises and customs to be screwed up to the utmost which the nation can bear, without entirely losing its commerce and industry; and suppose that all those funds are mortgaged to perpetuity, and that the invention and wit of all our projectors can find no new imposition, which may serve as the foundation of a new loan; and let us consider the necessary consequences of this situation. Though the imperfect state of our political knowledge, and the narrow capacities of men, make it difficult to foretell the effects which will result from any untried measure, the seeds of ruin are here scattered with such profusion as not to escape the eye of the most careless observer.

In this unnatural state of society, the only persons, who possess any revenue beyond the immediate effects of their industry, are the stockholders, who draw almost all the rent of the land and houses, besides the produce of all the customs and excises These are men who have no connexions with the state, who can enjoy their revenue in any part of the globe in which they chuse to reside, who will naturally bury themselves in the capital, or in great cities, and who will sink into the lethargy of a stupid and pampered luxury, without spirit, ambition, or enjoyment. Adieu to all ideas of nobility, gentry, and family The stocks can be transferred in an instant, and being in such a fluctuating state, will seldom be transmitted during three generations from father to son Or were they to remain ever so long in one family, they convey no hereditary authority or credit to the possessor and by this means the several ranks of men which form a kind of independent magistracy in a state, instituted by the hand of nature, are entirely lost, and every man in authority derives his influence from the commission alone of the sovereign No expedient remains for preventing or suppressing insurrections but mercenary armies no expedient at all remains for resisting tyranny elections are swayed by bribery and corruption alone and the middle power between king and people being totally removed, a grievous despotism must infallibly prevail The landholders, despised for their poverty, and hated for their oppression, will be utterly unable to make any opposition to it.

Though a resolution should be formed by the legislature never to impose any tax which hurts commerce and discourages industry, it will be impossible for men, in subjects of such extreme delicacy, to reason so justly as never to be mistaken, or amidst difficulties so urgent, never to be seduced from their resolution The continual fluctuations in commerce require continual alterations in the nature of the taxes, which exposes the legislature every moment to the danger both of wilful and involuntary error And any great blow given to trade, whether by injudicious taxes or by other accidents, throws the whole system of government into confusion

But what expedient can the public now employ, even supposing trade to continue in the most flourishing condition, in order to support its foreign wars and enterprises, and to defend its own honour and interest, or those of its allies? I do not ask how the public is to exert such a prodigious power as it has maintained during our late wars, where we have so much exceeded, not only our own natural strength, but even that of the greatest empires This extravagance is the abuse complained of, as the source of all the dangers to which we are at present exposed But since we must still suppose great commerce and opulence to remain, even after every fund is mortgaged, these riches must be defended by proportional power, and whence is the public to derive the revenue which supports it? It must plainly be from a

continual taxation of the annuities, or, which is the same thing, from mortgaging anew, on every exigency, a certain part of their annuities; and thus making them contribute to their own defence, and to that of the nation But the difficulties attending this system of policy will easily appear, whether we suppose the king to have become absolute master, or to be still controled by national councils, in which the annuitants themselves must necessarily bear the principal sway

If the prince has become absolute, as may naturally be expected from this situation of affairs, it is so easy for him to increase his exactions upon the annuitants, which amount only to the retaining of money in his own hands, that this species of property would soon lose all its credit, and the whole income of every individual in the state must lie entirely at the mercy of the sovereign a degree of despotism, which no oriental monarch has ever yet attained If, on the contrary, the consent of the annuitants be requisite for every taxation, they will never be persuaded to contribute sufficiently even to the support of government, as the diminution of their revenue must in that case be very sensible, it would not be disguised under the appearance of a branch of excise or customs, and would not be shared by any other order of the state, who are already supposed to be taxed to the utmost. There are instances, in some republics, of a hundredth penny, and sometimes of the fiftieth, being given to the support of the state, but this is always an extraordinary exertion of power, and can never become the foundation of a constant national defence We have always found, where a government has mortgaged all its revenues, that it necessarily sinks into a state of languor, inactivity, and impotence

Such are the inconveniences, which may reasonably be foreseen of this situation, to which Great Britain is visibly tending Not to mention the numberless inconveniencies, which cannot be foreseen, and which must result from so monstrous a situation as that of making the public the chief or sole proprietor of land, besides investing it with every branch of customs and excise, which the fertile imagination of ministers and projectors have been able to invent.

I must confess, that there is a strange supineness, from long custom, creeped into all ranks of men, with regard to public debts, not unlike what divines so vehemently complain of with regard to their religious doctrines. We all own that the most sanguine imagination cannot hope, either that this or any future ministry will be possessed of such rigid and steady frugality, as to make a considerable progress, in the payment of our debts, or that the situation of foreign affairs will, for any long time, allow them leisure and tranquility for such an undertaking *What then is to become of us?* Were we ever so good Christians, and ever so resigned to providence, this, methinks, were a curious question, even considered as a speculative one, and what it might not be altogether impossible to form some conjectural solution

of The events here will depend little upon the contingencies of battles, negociations, intrigues, and factions There seems to be a natural progress of things, which may guide our reasoning As it would have required but a moderate share of prudence, when we first began this practice of mortgaging, to have foretold, from the nature of men and of ministers, that things would necessarily be carried to the length we see, so now that they have at last happily reached it, it may not be difficult to guess at the consequences It must, indeed, be one of these two events, either the nation must destroy public credit, or public credit will destroy the nation It is impossible that they can both subsist, after the manner they have been hitherto managed, in this, as well as in some other countries

There was, indeed, a scheme for the payment of our debts, which was proposed by an excellent citizen, Mr Hutchinson, above thirty years ago, and which was much approved of by some men of sense, but never was likely to take effect He asserted that there was a fallacy in imagining that the public owed this debt, for that really every individual owed a proportional share of it, and paid, in his taxes, a proportional share of the interest, beside the expense of levying these taxes Had we not better, then, says he, make a distribution of the debt among ourselves, and each of us contribute a sum suitable to his property, and by that means discharge at once all our funds and public mortgages? He seems not to have considered that the laborious poor pay a considerable part of the taxes by their annual consumptions, though they could not advance, at once, a proportional part of the sum required Not to mention, that property in money and stock in trade might easily be concealed or disguised and that visible property in lands and houses would really at last answer for the whole an inequality and oppression, which never would be submitted to But though this project is not likely to take place, it is not altogether improbable, that, when the nation becomes heartily sick of their debts, and is cruelly oppressed by them, some daring projector may arise with visionary schemes for their discharge And as public credit will begin, by that time, to be a little frail, the least touch will destroy it, as happened in France during the regency, and in this manner it will *die of the docto*

But it is more probable, that the breach of national faith will be the necessary effect of wars defeats, misfortunes, and public calamities, or even perhaps of victories and conquests I must confess, when I see princes and states fighting and quarrelling, amidst their debts, funds, and public mortgages, it always brings to my mind a match of cudgel-playing fought in a *China* shop How can it be expected, that sovereigns will spare a species of property, which is pernicious to themselves and to the public, when they have so little compassion on lives and properties, that are useful to both? Let the time come (and

surely it will come) when the new funds, created for the exigencies of the year, are not subscribed to, and raise not the money projected. Suppose, either that the cash of the nation is exhausted, or that our faith, which has hitherto been so ample, begin to fail us Suppose, that, in this distress, the nation is threatened with an invasion, a rebellion is suspected or broken out at home, a squadron cannot be equipped for want of pay, victuals, or repairs or even a foreign subsidy cannot be advanced, What must a prince or minister do in such an emergence? The right of self-preservation is unalienable in every individual, much more in every community And the folly of our statesmen must then be greater than the folly of those who trusted, or continue to trust this security, if these statesmen have the means of safety in their hands, and not employ them The funds, created and mortgaged, will by that time, bring in a large yearly revenue, sufficient for the defence and security of the nation money is perhaps lying in the exchequer, ready for the discharge of the quarterly interest necessity calls, fear urges, reason exhorts, compassion alone exclaims the money will immediately be seized for the current service, under the most solemn protestations, perhaps, of being immediately replaced But no more is requisite. The whole fabric, already tottering, falls to the ground, and buries thousands in its ruins And this, I think, may be called the *natural death* of public credit for to this period it tends as naturally as an animal body to its dissolution.

So great dupes are the generality of mankind, that, notwithstanding such a violent shock to public credit, as a voluntary bankruptcy in England would occasion, it would not probably be long ere credit would again revive in as flourishing a condition as before The present king of France, during the late war, borrowed money at a lower interest than ever his grandfather did, and as low as the British parliament, comparing the natural rate of interest in both kingdoms And though men are commonly more governed by what they have seen, than by what they foresee, with whatever certainty, yet promises, protestations, fair appearances, with the allurements of present interest, have such powerful influence as few are able to resist Mankind are, in all ages, caught by the same baits the same tricks, played over and over again, still trepan them. The heights of popularity and patriotism are still the beaten road to power and tyranny, flattery, to treachery, standing armies to arbitrary government, and the glory of God to the temporal interest of the clergy The fear of an everlasting destruction of credit, allowing it to be an evil, is a needless bugbear A prudent man, in reality, would rather lend to the public immediately after we had taken a spunge to our debts, than at present, as much as an opulent knave, even though one could not force him to pay, is a preferable debtor to an honest bankrupt; for the former, in order to carry on business

may find it his interest to discharge his debts, where they are not exorbitant: the latter has it not in his power. The reasoning of Tacitus [Hist. lib. ii.] as it is eternally true, is very applicable to our present case. *Sed vulgus ad magnitudinem beneficiorum aderat: stultissimus quisque pecuniis mercabatur: apud sapientes cassa habebantur, quæ neque accipi, salva republica, poterant.* The public is a debtor, whom no man can oblige to pay. The only check which the creditors have upon her, is the interest of preserving credit; an interest, which may easily be overbalanced by a great debt, and by a difficult and extraordinary emergence, even supposing that credit irrecoverable. Not to mention, that a present necessity often forces states into measures, which are, strictly speaking, against their interest.

These two events supposed above, are calamitous, but not the most calamitous. Thousands are thereby sacrificed to the safety of millions. But we are not without danger, that the contrary event may be sacrificed for ever to the temporary safety of thousands.* Our popular government, perhaps, will render it difficult or dangerous for a minister to venture on so desperate an expedient, as that of a voluntary bankruptcy. And though the house of Lords be altogether composed of proprietors of land, and the house of Commons chiefly; and consequently neither of them can be supposed to have great property in the funds: yet the connections of the members may be so great with the proprietors, as to render them more tenacious of public faith, than prudence, policy, or even justice, strictly speaking, requires. And perhaps, too, our foreign enemies may be so politic as to discover, that our safety lies in despair, and may not, therefore, show the danger, open and barefaced, till it be inevitable. The balance of power in Europe, our grandfathers, our fathers, and we, have all deemed too unequal to be preserved without our attention and assistance. But our children, weary of the struggle, and fettered with incumbrances, may sit down secure, and see their neighbours oppressed and conquered; till, at last, they themselves and their creditors lie both at the mercy of the conqueror. And this may properly enough be denominated the *violent death* of our public credit.

These seem to be the events, which are not very remote, and which reason foresees as clearly almost as she can do any thing that lies in the womb of time. And though the ancients maintained, that, in order

* I HAVE heard it has been computed that all the creditors of the public natives and foreigners amount only to 17,000. These make a figure at present on their income; but in case of a public bankruptcy, would in an instant become the lowest, as well as the most wretched of the people. The dignity and authority of the landed gentry and nobility is much better rooted; and would render the contention very unequal, if ever we come to that extremity. One would incline to assign to this event a very near period, such as half a century, had not our fathers prophecies of this kind been already found fallacious, by the duration of our public credit so much beyond all reasonable expectation. When the astrologers in France were every year foretelling the death of Henry IV. 'These fellows,' says he, 'must be right at last.' We shall, therefore, be more cautious than to assign any precise date; and shall content ourselves with pointing out the event in general.

to reach the gift of prophecy, a certain divine fury or madness was requisite, one may safely affirm, that, in order to deliver such prophecies as these, no more is necessary than merely to be in one's senses, free from the influence of popular madness and delusion.

XXXII.—OF SOME REMARKABLE CUSTOMS.

I shall observe three remarkable customs in three celebrated governments; and shall conclude from the whole, that all general maxims in politics ought to be established with great caution; and that irregular and extraordinary appearances are frequently discovered in the moral, as well as in the physical world. The former, perhaps, we can better account for, after they happen, from springs and principles, of which every one has, within himself, or from observation, the strongest assurance and conviction: but it is often fully as impossible for human prudence, beforehand, to forsee and foretel them.

I. One would think it essential to every supreme council or assembly, which debates, that entire liberty of speech should be granted to every member, and that all motions or reasonings should be received, which can any way tend to illustrate the point under deliberation. One would conclude, with still greater assurance, that, after a motion was made, which was voted and approved by that assembly in which the legislative power is lodged, the member who made the motion must for ever be exempted from future trial or inquiry. But no political maxim can, at first sight, appear more indisputable, than that he must, at least, be secured from all inferior jurisdiction; and that nothing less than the same supreme legislative assembly, in their subsequent meetings, could make him accountable for those motions and harangues, to which they had before given their approbation. But these axioms, however irrefragable they may appear, have all failed in the Athenian government, from causes and principles too, which appear almost inevitable.

By the γραφη παρανομων or *indictment of illegality*, (though it has not been remarked by antiquaries or commentators) any man was tried and punished in a common court of judicature, for any law which had passed upon his motion, in the assembly of the people, if that law appeared to the court unjust, or prejudicial to the public. Thus Demosthenes, finding that ship-money was levied irregularly, and that the poor bore the same burden as the rich in equipping the gallies, corrected this inequality by a very useful law, which proportioned the expense to the revenue and income of each individual. He moved for

this law in the assembly, he proved its advantages,* he convinced the people, the only legislature in Athens, the law passed, and was carried into execution: yet was he tried in a criminal court for that law, upon the complaint of the rich, who resented the alteration that he had introduced into the finances. [Pro Ctesiphonte.] He was indeed acquitted, upon proving anew the usefulness of his law.

Ctesiphon moved in the assembly of the people, that particular honours should be conferred on Demosthenes, as on a citizen affectionate and useful to the commonwealth: the people convinced of this truth, voted those honours: yet was Ctesiphon tried by the γραφη παρανομων. It was asserted, among other topics, that Demosthenes was not a good citizen, nor affectionate to the commonwealth: and the orator was called upon to defend his friend, and consequently himself; which he executed by that sublime piece of eloquence, that has ever since been the admiration of mankind.

After the battle of Chæronea, a law was passed upon the motion of Hyperides, giving liberty to slaves, and enrolling them in the troops.† On account of this law, the orator was afterwards tried by the indictment above mentioned, and defended himself, among other topics, by that stroke celebrated by Plutarch and Longinus. *It was not I*, said he, *that moved for this law: it was the necessities of war; it was the battle of Chæronea.* The orations of Demosthenes abound with many instances of trials of this nature, and prove clearly, that nothing was more commonly practised.

The Athenian Democracy was such a tumultuous government as we can scarcely form a notion of in the present age of the world. The whole collective body of the people voted in every law, without any limitation of property, without any distinction of rank, without control from any magistracy or senate,‡ and consequently without regard to order, justice, or prudence. The Athenians soon became sensible of the mischiefs attending this constitution: but being averse to checking themselves by any rule or restriction, they resolved, at least, to check their demagogues or counsellors by the fear of future punishment and inquiry. They accordingly instituted this remarkable law, a law esteemed so essential to their form of government, that Æschines insists on it as a known truth, that, were it abolished or neglected, it were impossible for the Democracy to subsist.§

* His harangue for it is still extant: Περι Συμμοριας.

† Plutarchus *in vita decem oratorum.* Demosthenes gives a different account of this law. *Contra* Aristogiton *orat.* II. He says that its purport was to render the ατιμοι επιτιμοι, or to restore the privilege of bearing offices to those who had been declared incapable. Perhaps these were both clauses of the same law.

‡ The senate of the Bean was only a less numerous mob, chosen by lot from among the people: and their authority was not great.

§ In Ctesiphontem. It is remarkable, that the first step after the dissolution of the Democracy by Critias and the thirty, was to annul the γραφη παρανομων, as we learn from Demosthenes κατα Τιμοκ. The orator in this oration gives us the words of the law, establishing the γραφη παρανομων, page 297, *ex edit.* Aldi. And he accounts for it from the same principles we here reason upon.

The people feared not any ill consequence to liberty from the authority of the criminal courts, because these were nothing but very numerous juries, chosen by lot from among the people And they justly considered themselves as in a state of perpetual pupilage, where they had an authority, after they came to the use of reason, not only to retract and control whatever had been determined, but to punish any guardian for measures which they had embraced by his persuasion The same law had place in Thebes [Plut *in vita* Pelop] and for the same reason

It appears to have been a usual practice in Athens, on the establishment of any law esteemed very useful or popular, to prohibit for ever its abrogation and repeal

Thus the demagogue, who diverted all the public revenues to the support of shows and spectacles, made it criminal so much as to move for a repeal of this law [Demost *Olynth* 1 2] Thus Leptines moved for a law, not only to recal all the immunities formerly granted, but to deprive the people for the future of the power of granting any more [Demost *contra* Lept] Thus all bills of attainder [Demost *contra* Aristocratem] were forbid, or laws that affected one Athenian, without extending to the whole commonwealth These absurd clauses, by which the legislature vainly attempted to bind itself for ever, proceeded from an universal sense in the people of their own levity and inconstancy

II A wheel within a wheel, such as we observe in the German empire, is considered by Lord Shaftesbury* as an absurdity in politics but what must we say to two equal wheels, which govern the same political machine, without any mutual check, control, or subordination, and yet preserve the greatest harmony and concord? To establish two distinct legislatures, each of which possess full and absolute authority within itself, and stands in no need of the other's assistance, in order to give validity to its acts, this may appear, before-hand, altogether impracticable, as long as men are actuated by the passions of ambition, emulation, and avarice, which have hitherto been their governing principles And should I assert, that the state I have in my eye was divided into two distinct factions, each of which predominated in a distinct legislature and yet produced no clashing in these independent powers, the supposition may appear incredible And if, to augment the paradox, I should affirm that this disjointed irregular government, was the most active, triumphant, and illustrious commonwealth that ever appeared, I should certainly be told, that such a political chimera was as absurd as any vision of priests or poets But there is no need for searching long, in order to prove the reality of the foregoing suppositions for this was actually the case with the Roman republic.

* Essay on the freedom of wit and humour, part 3 § 2.

The legislative power was there lodged in the *comitia centuriata* and *comitia tributa* In the former, it is well known, the people voted according to their *census*, so that when the first class was unanimous, though it contained not, perhaps, the hundreth part of the commonwealth, it determined the whole, and, with the authority of the senate, established law In the latter, every vote was equal, and as the authority of the senate was not there requisite, the lower people entirely prevailed, and gave law to the whole state In all party-divisions, at first between the Patricians and Plebeians, afterwards between the nobles and the people, the interest of the aristocracy was predominant in the first legislature, that of the democracy in the second the one could always destroy what the other had established nay, the one, by a sudden and unforseen motion, might take the start of the other and totally annihilate its rival, by a vote, which, from the nature of the constitution, had the full authority of a law But no such contest is observed in the history of Rome no instance of a quarrel between these two legislatures though many between the parties that governed in each Whence arose this concord, which may seem so extraordinary?

The legislature established in Rome, by the authority of Servius Tullius, was the *comitia centuriata*, which, after the expulsion of the kings rendered the government for some time very aristocratical But the people having numbers and force on their side, and being elated with frequent conquests and victories in their foreign wars, always prevailed when pushed to extremity, and first extorted from the senate the magistracy of the tribunes, and next the legislative power of the *comitia tributa* It then behoved the nobles to be more careful than ever not to provoke the people For beside the force which the latter were always possessed of, they had now got possession of legal authority, and could instantly break in pieces any order or institution which directly opposed them By intrigue, by influence by money, by combination, and by the respect paid to their character, the nobles might often prevail, and direct the whole machine of government but had they openly set their *comitia centuriata* in opposition to the *tributa*, they had soon lost the advantage of that institution, together with their consuls, prætors, ediles, and all the magistrates elected by it But the *comitia tributa*, not having the same reason for respecting the *centuriata*, frequently repealed laws favourable to the aristocracy they limited the authority of the nobles, protected the people from oppression, and controled the actions of the senate and magistracy The *centuriata* found it convenient always to submit, and though equal in authority, yet being inferior in power, durst never directly give any shock to the other legislature, either by repealing its laws, or establishing laws which it foresaw would soon be repealed by it.

No instance is found of any opposition or struggle between these

comitia, except one slight attempt of this kind, mentioned by Appian in the third book of his civil wars Mark Anthony, resolving to deprive Decimus Brutus of the government of Cisalpine Gaul, railed in the *Forum*, and called one of the *comitia*, in order to prevent the meeting of the other, which had been ordered by the senate But affairs were then fallen into such confusion, and the Roman constitution was so near its final dissolution, that no inference can be drawn from such an expedient This contest, besides, was founded more on form than party It was the senate who ordered the *comitia tributa*, that they might obstruct the meeting of the *centuriata*, which, by the constitution, or at least forms of the government, could alone dispose of provinces

Cicero was recalled by the *comitia centuriata*, though banished by the *tributa*, that is, by a *plebiscitum* But his banishment, we may observe, never was considered as a legal deed, arising from the free choice and inclination of the people It was always ascribed to the violence alone of Clodius, and to the disorders introduced by him into the government

III The *third* custom, which we purpose to remark, regards England, and though it be not so important as those which we have pointed out in Athens and Rome, is no less singular and unexpected It is a maxim in politics, which we readily admit as undisputed and universal, that a power, however great, when granted by law to an eminent magistrate, is not so dangerous to liberty, as an authority, however inconsiderable, which he acquires from violence and usurpation For, besides that the law always limits every power which it bestows, the very receiving it as a concession establishes the authority whence it is derived, and preserves the harmony of the constitution By the same right that one prerogative is assumed without law, another may also be claimed, and another, with still greater facility, while the first usurpations both serve as precedents to the following, and give force to maintain them Hence the heroism of Hampden's conduct, who sustained the whole violence of royal prosecution, rather than pay a tax of 20 shillings not imposed by parliament, hence the care of all the English patriots to guard against the first encroachments of the crown, and hence alone the existence at this day, of English liberty

There is, however, one occasion, where the parliament has departed from this maxim, and that is, in the *pressing of seamen* The exercise of an irregular power is here tacitly permitted in the crown, and though it has frequently been under deliberation, how that power might be rendered legal, and granted, under proper restrictions, to the sovereign, no safe expedient could ever be proposed for that purpose, and the danger to liberty always appeared greater from law than from usurpation. When this power is exercised to no other end, than to man the navy, men willingly submit to it, from a sense of its use and

necessity, and the sailors, who are alone affected by it, find no body to support them, in claiming the rights and privileges which the law grants, without distinction, to all English subjects But were this power, on any occasion, made an instrument of faction or ministerial tyranny, the opposite faction, and indeed all lovers of their country, would immediately take the alarm, and support the injured party, the liberty of Englishmen would be asserted, juries would be implacable, and the tools of tyranny, acting both against law and equity, would meet with the severest vengeance On the other hand, were the parliament to grant such an authority, they would probably fall into one of these two inconveniences they would either bestow it under so many restrictions as would make it lose its effect, by cramping the authority of the crown, or they would render it so large and comprehensive, as might give occasion to great abuses, for which we could, in that case, have no remedy The very irregularity of the practice of impressment, at present, prevents its abuses, by affording so easy a remedy against them

I pretend not, by this reasoning, to exclude all possibility of contriving a register for seamen, which might man the navy, without being dangerous to liberty I only observe, that no satisfactory scheme of that nature has yet been proposed Rather than adopt any project hitherto invented, we continue a practice seemingly the most absurd and unaccountable Authority, in times of full internal peace and concord, is armed against law A continued violence is permitted in the crown, amidst the greatest jealousy and watchfulness in the people, nay, proceeding from those very principles liberty in a country of the highest liberty, is left entirely to its own defence, without any countenance or protection the wild state of nature is renewed, in one of the most civilized societies of mankind and great violence and disorder are committed with impunity, while the one party pleads obedience to the supreme magistrate, the other the sanction of fundamental laws. [The practice has long since been abolished, 1869.]

XXXIII—OF THE POPULOUSNESS OF ANCIENT NATIONS

THERE is very little ground, either from reason or observation, to conclude the world eternal or incorruptible The continual and rapid motion of matter, the violent revolutions with which every part is agitated, the changes remarked in the heavens, the plain traces as well as tradition of an universal deluge, or general convulsion of the

elements; all these prove strongly the mortality of this fabric of the world, and its passage, by corruption or dissolution, from one state or order to another. It must therefore, as well as each individual form which it contains, have its infancy, youth, manhood, and old age; and it is probable, that, in all these variations, man, equally with every animal and vegetable, will partake. In the flourishing age of the world, it may be expected, that the human species should possess greater vigour both of mind and body, more prosperous health, higher spirits, longer life, and a stronger inclination and power of generation. But if the general system of things, and human society of course, have any such gradual revolutions, they are too slow to be discernible in that short period which is comprehended by history and tradition. Stature and force of body, length of life, even courage and extent of genius, seem hitherto to have been naturally, in all ages, pretty much the same. The arts and sciences, indeed, have flourished in one period, and have decayed in another: but we may observe, that, at the time when they rose to greatest perfection among one people, they were perhaps totally unknown to all the neighbouring nations; and though they universally decayed in one age, yet in a succeeding generation they again revived, and diffused themselves over the world. As far, therefore, as observation reaches, there is no universal difference discernible in the human species; and though it were allowed, that the universe, like an animal body, had a natural progress from infancy to old age; yet as it must still be uncertain, whether, at present, it be advancing to its point of perfection, or declining from it, we cannot thence presuppose any decay in human nature.* To prove, therefore, or account for that superior populousness of antiquity, which is commonly supposed, by the imaginary youth or vigour of the world, will scarcely be admitted by any just reasoner. These *general physical* causes ought entirely to be excluded from this question.

There are indeed some more *particular physical* causes of importance. Diseases are mentioned in antiquity, which are almost unknown to modern medicine; and new diseases have arisen and propagated themselves, of which there are no traces in ancient history. In this particular we may observe, upon comparison, that the disadvantage is much on the side of the moderns. Not to mention some others of less moment; the small-pox commits such ravages, as would almost alone account for the great superiority ascribed to ancient times. The tenth or the twelfth part of mankind, destroyed every generation, should make a vast difference, it may be thought, in the numbers of the

* COLUMELLA says, lib. iii. cap. 8. that in Egypt and Africa the bearing of twins was frequent, and even customary; *gemini partus familiares, ac pene solennes sunt.* If this was true, there is a physical difference both in countries and ages. For travellers make no such remarks on these countries at present. On the contrary, we are apt to suppose the northern nations more prolific. As those two countries were provinces of the Roman empire, it is difficult, though not altogether absurd, to suppose that such a man as Columella might be mistaken with regard to them.

people, and when joined to venereal distempers, a new plague diffused everywhere, this disease is perhaps equivalent, by its constant operation, to the three great scourges of mankind; war, pestilence, and famine. Were it certain, therefore, that ancient times were more populous than the present, and could no moral causes be assigned for so great a change, these physical causes alone in the opinion of many, would be sufficient to give us satisfaction on that head.

But is it certain, that antiquity was so much more populous, as is pretended? The extravagancies of Vossius, with regard to this subject are well known. But an author of much greater genius and discernment has ventured to affirm, that, according to the best computations which these subjects will admit of, there are not now, on the face of the earth, the fiftieth part of mankind, which existed in the time of Julius Cæsar.* It may easily be observed, that the comparison, in this case, must be imperfect, even though we confine ourselves to the scene of ancient history, Europe, and the nations round the Mediterranean. We know not exactly the numbers of any European kingdom, or even city, at present: how can we pretend to calculate those of ancient cities and states, where historians have left us such imperfect traces? For my part, the matter appears to me so uncertain, that, as I intend to throw together some reflections on that head, I shall intermingle the inquiry concerning *causes* with that concerning *facts*, which ought never to be admitted, where the facts can be ascertained with any tolerable assurance. We shall, *first*, consider whether it be probable, from what we know of the situation of society in both periods, that antiquity must have been more populous; *secondly*, whether in reality it was so. If I can make it appear, that the conclusion is not so certain as is pretended, in favour of antiquity, it is all I aspire to.

In general, we may observe, that the question with regard to the comparative populousness of ages or kingdoms, implies important consequences, and commonly determines concerning the preference of their whole police, their manners, and the constitution of their government. For as there is in all men, both male and female, a desire and power of generation, more active than is ever universally exerted, the restraints, which they lie under, must proceed from some difficulties in their situation, which it belongs to a wise legislature carefully to observe and remove. Almost every man, who thinks he can maintain a family, will have one, and the human species, at this rate of propagation, would more than double every generation. How fast do mankind multiply in every colony or new settlement, where it is an easy matter to provide for a family, and where men are no wise straitened or confined as in long established governments? History tells us frequently of plagues, which have swept away the third or

* *Letters Persanes.* See also *L'Esprit de Loix*, liv. xxiii. cap. 17, 18, 19.

fourth part of a people yet in a generation or two, the destruction was not perceived; and the society had again acquired their former number The lands which were cultivated, the houses built, the commodities raised, the riches acquired, enabled the people, who escaped, immediately to marry and to rear families, which supplied the place of those who had perished * And, for a like reason, every wise, just, and mild government, by rendering the condition of its subjects easy and secure, will always abound most in people, as well as in commodities and riches A country, indeed, whose climate and soil are fitted for vines, will naturally be more populous than one which produces corn only, and that more populous than one which is only fitted for pasturage. In general, warm climates, as the necessities of the inhabitants are there fewer, and vegetation more powerful, are likely to be most populous but if everything else be equal, it seems natural to expect that, wherever there are most happiness and virtue, and the wisest institutions, there will also be most people

The question, therefore, concerning the populousness of ancient and modern times, being allowed of great importance, it will be requisite, if we would bring it to some determination, to compare both the *domestic* and *political* situation of these two periods, in order to judge of the facts by their moral causes, which is the *first* view in which we proposed to consider them

The chief difference between the *domestic* economy of the ancients and that of the moderns, consists in the practice of slavery, which prevailed among the former, and which has been abolished for some centuries throughout the greater part of Europe Some passionate admirers of the ancients, and zealous partizans of civil liberty (for these sentiments, as they are, both of them, in the main, extremely just, are found to be almost inseparable), cannot forbear regretting the loss of this institution, and whilst they brand all submission to the government of a single person with the harsh denomination of slavery they would gladly reduce the greater part of mankind to real slavery and subjection But to one who considers coolly on the subject, it will appear, that human nature, in general, really enjoys more liberty at present, in the most arbitrary government of Europe, than it ever did during the most flourishing period of ancient times. As much as submission to a petty prince, whose dominions extend not before a single city, is more grevious than obedience to a great monarch, so much is domestic slavery more cruel and oppressive than any civil subjection whatsoever The more the master is removed from us in place and rank, the greater liberty we enjoy, the less are our actions

* This too is a good reason why the small-pox does not depopulate countries so much as may at first sight be imagined. Where there is room for more people, they will always arise, even without the assistance of naturalisation bills It is remarked by Don Geronimo De Ustariz, that the provinces of Spain, which send most people to the Indies, are most populous; which proceeds from their superior riches

inspected and controlled, and the fainter that cruel comparison becomes between our own subjection, and the freedom, and even dominion of another. The remains which are found of domestic slavery in the American colonies, and among some European nations, would never surely create a desire of rendering it more universal. The little humanity, commonly observed in persons, accustomed, from their infancy, to exercise so great authority over their fellow-creatures, and to trample upon human nature, were sufficient alone to disgust us with that unbounded dominion. Nor can a more probable reason be assigned for the severe, I might say, barbarous manners of ancient times, than the practice of domestic slavery; by which every man of rank was rendered a petty tyrant, and educated amidst the flattery, submission, and low debasement of his slaves.

According to ancient practice, all checks were on the inferior, to restrain him to the duty of submission; none on the superior, to engage him to the reciprocal duties of gentleness and humanity. In modern times, a bad servant finds not easily a good master, nor a bad master a good servant; the checks are mutual, suitably to the inviolable and external laws of reason and equity.

The custom of exposing old, useless, or sick slaves in an island of the Tyber, there to starve, seems to have been pretty common in Rome; and whoever recovered, after having been so exposed, had his liberty given him by an edict of the emperor Claudius, in which it was likewise forbidden to kill any slave merely for old age or sickness. [Suetonius in vita Claudii.] But supposing that this edict was strictly obeyed, would it better the domestic treatment of slaves, or render their lives much more comfortable? We may imagine what others would practise, when it was the professed maxim of the elder Cato, to sell his superannuated slaves for any price, rather than maintain what he esteemed a useless burden. [Plut. in vita Catonis.]

The *ergastula*, or dungeons, where slaves in chains were forced to work, were very common all over Italy. Columella [Lib. i. cap. 6.] advises, that they be always built under ground; and recommends [Id. lib. xi. cap. I.] it as the duty of a careful overseer, to call over every day the names of these slaves, like the mustering of a regiment or ship's company, in order to know presently when any of them had deserted. A proof of the frequency of these *ergastula*, and of the great number of slaves usually confined in them.

A chained slave for a porter, was usual in Rome, as appears from Ovid, [Amor. lib. i. eleg. 6.] and other authors.* Had not these people shaken off all sense of compassion towards that unhappy part

* Suetonius, *de claris rhetor.* So also the ancient poet, *Janitoris tintinnire impedimenta audio.*

of their species, would they have presented their friends, at the first entrance, with such an image of the severity of the master, and misery of the slave?

Nothing so common in all trials, even of civil causes, as to call for the evidence of slaves, which was always extorted by the most exquisite torments. Demosthenes says, [In *Oniterem orat.*] that, where it was possible to produce, for the same fact, either freemen or slaves, as witnesses, the judges always preferred the torturing of slaves, as a more certain evidence.*

Seneca draws a picture of that disorderly luxury, which changes day into night, and night into day, and inverts every stated hour of every office in life. Among other circumstances, such as displacing the meals and times of bathing, he mentions, that, regularly about the third hour of the night, the neighbours of one, who indulges this false refinement, hear the noise of whips and lashes, and, upon inquiry, find that he is then taking an account of the conduct of his servants, and giving them due correction and discipline. This is not remarked as an instance of cruelty, but only of disorder, which, even in actions the most usual and methodical, changes the fixed hours that an established custom had assigned for them.†

But our present business is only to consider the influence of slavery on the populousness of a state. It is pretended, that, in this particular, the ancient practice had infinitely the advantage, and was the chief cause of that extreme populousness, which is supposed in those times. At present all masters discourage the marrying of their male servants, and admit not by any means the marriage of the female, who are then supposed altogether incapacitated for their service. But where the property of the servants is lodged in the master, their marriage forms his riches, and brings him a succession of slaves, that supply the place of those whom age and infirmity have disabled. He encourages, therefore their propagation as much as that of his cattle, rears the young with the same care, and educates them to some art or calling, which may render them more useful or valuable to him. The opulent are, by this policy, interested in the being at least, though not in the well-being of the poor, and enrich themselves

* The same practice was very common in Rome; but Cicero seems not to think this evidence so certain as the testimony of free citizens.—*Pro Cælio.*

† Epist. 122. The inhuman sports exhibited at Rome may justly be considered too as an effect of the people's contempt for slaves, and was also a great cause of the general inhumanity of their princes and rulers. Who can read the accounts of the amphitheatrical entertainments without horror? Or who is surprised, that the emperors should treat that people in the same way the people treated their inferiors? One's humanity is apt to renew the barbarous wish of Caligula, that the people had but one neck: a man could almost be pleased, by a single blow, to put an end to such a race of monsters. You may thank God, says the author above cited, (*epist.* 7.) addressing himself to the Roman people, that you have a master, (to wit, the mild and merciful Nero) who is incapable of learning cruelty from your example. This was spoke in the beginning of his reign; but he fitted them very well afterwards; and, no doubt, was considerably improved by the sight of the barbarous objects, to which he had, from his infancy, been accustomed.

by increasing the number and industry of those who are subjected to them. Each man, being a sovereign in his own family, has the same interest with regard to it, as the prince with regard to the state; and has not, like the prince, any opposite motives of ambition or vain-glory, which may lead him to depopulate his little sovereignty. All of it is, at all times, under his eye; and he has leisure to inspect the most minute detail of the marriage and education of his subjects.*

Such are the consequences of domestic slavery, according to the first aspect and appearance of things: but if we enter more deeply into the subject, we shall perhaps find reason to retract our hasty determinations. The comparison is shocking between the management of human creatures and that of cattle; but being extremely just, when applied to the present subject, it may be proper to trace the consequences of it. At the capital, near all great cities, in all populous, rich, industrious provinces, few cattle are bred. Provisions, lodgings, attendance, labour are there dear; and men find their account better in buying the cattle, after they come to a certain age, from the remoter and cheaper countries. These are consequently the only breeding countries for cattle; and, by a parity of reason, for men too, when the latter are put on the same footing with the former. To rear a child in London, till he could be serviceable, would cost much dearer, than to buy one of the same age from Scotland or Ireland; where he had been bred in a cottage, covered with rags, and fed on oatmeal and potatoes. Those who had slaves, therefore, in all the richer and more populous countries, would discourage the pregnancy of the females, and either prevent or destroy the birth. The human species would perish in those places where it ought to increase the fastest; and a perpetual recruit be wanted from the poorer and more desert provinces. Such a continued drain would tend mightily to depopulate the state, and render great cities ten times more destructive than with us; where every man is master of himself, and provides for his children from the powerful instinct of nature, not the calculations of sordid interest. If London, at present, without much increasing, needs a yearly recruit from the country of 5000 people, as is usually computed, what must it require, if the greater part of the tradesmen and common people were slaves, and were hindered from breeding by their avaricious masters?

All ancient authors tell us, that there was a perpetual flux of slaves to Italy, from the remoter provinces, particularly Syria, Cilicia,† Cappadocia, and the Lesser Asia, Thrace, and Egypt: yet the number of

* We may here observe, that if domestic slavery really increased populousness, it would be an exception to the general rule, that the happiness of any society and its populousness are necessary attendants. A master, from humour or interest, may make his slaves very unhappy, yet be careful, from interest, to increase their number. Their marriage is not a matter of choice, to them, more than any other action of their life.

† Ten thousand slaves in a day have often been sold for the use of the Romans, at Delus in Cilicia. Strabo, lib. xiv.

people did not increase in Italy, and writers complain of the continual decay of industry and agriculture.* Where then is that extreme fertility of the Roman slaves which is commonly supposed? So far from multiplying, they could not, it seems, so much as keep up the stock without immense recruits. And though great numbers were continually manumitted and converted into Roman citizens, the numbers even of these did not increase,† till the freedom of the city was communicated to foreign provinces.

The term for a slave, born and bred in the family, was *verna*;‡ and these slaves seem to have been entitled by custom to privileges and indulgencies beyond others; a sufficient reason why the masters would not be fond of rearing many of that kind.§ Whoever is acquainted with the maxims of our planters, will acknowledge the justness of this observation.‖

Atticus is much praised by his historian, for the care which he took in recruiting his family from the slaves born in it.¶ May we not thence infer, that this practice was not then very common?

The names of slaves in the Greek comedies, SYRUS, MYSUS, GETA, THRAX, DAVUS, LYDUS, PHRYX, &c. afford a presumption, that, at

* Columella lib. 1. *proœm.* et cap. 2. et 7. Varro lib. iii. cap. 1. Horat. lib. ii. od. 15. Tacit. *annal.* lib. iii. cap. 54. Sueton. *in vita* Aug. cap. xlii. Plin. lib. xviii. cap. 13.

† *Minore indies plebe ingenua*, says Tacitus, *ann.* lib. xxiv. cap. 7.

‡ As *servus* was the name of the genus, and *verna* of the species, without any correlative, this forms a strong presumption, that the latter were by far the least numerous. It is an universal observation which we may form upon language, that where two related parts of a whole bear any proportion to each other, in numbers, rank, or consideration, there are always correlative terms invented, which answer to both the parts, and express their mutual relation. If they bear no proportion to each other, the term is only invented for the less, and marks its distinction from the whole. Thus *man* and *woman*, *master* and *servant*, *father* and *son*, *prince* and *subject*, *stranger* and *citizen*, are correlative terms. But the words *seamen*, *carpenter*, *smith*, *tailor*, &c. have no correspondent terms, which express those who are no seamen, no carpenters, &c. Languages differ very much with regard to the particular words where this distinction obtains; and may thence afford very strong inferences concerning the manners and customs of different nations. The military government of the Roman emperors had exalted the soldiery so high, that they balanced all the other orders of the state. Hence *miles* and *paganus* became relative terms; a thing, till then, unknown to ancient, and still so to modern languages. Modern superstition exalted the clergy so high, that they overbalanced the whole state: hence *clergy* and *laity* are terms opposed in all modern languages; and in these alone. And from the same principles I infer, that if the number of slaves bought by the Romans from foreign countries had not extremely exceeded those which were bred at home, *verna* would have had a correlative, which would have expressed the former species of slaves. But these, it would seem, composed the main body of the ancient slaves, and the latter were but a few exceptions.

§ *Verna* is used by Roman writers as a word equivalent to *scurra*, on account of the petulance and impudence of those slaves. Mart. lib. i. ep. 42. Horace also mentions the *vernæ procaces*; and Petronius, cap. 24. *vernula urbanitas*. Seneca, *de provid.* cap. 1. *vernularum licentia*.

‖ It is computed in the West Indies, that a stock of slaves grow worse *five per cent.* every year, unless new slaves be bought to recruit them. They are not able to keep up their number, even in those warm countries, where clothes and provisions are so easily got. How much more must this happen in European countries, and in or near great cities? I shall add, that, from the experience of our planters, slavery is as little advantageous to the master as to the slave, wherever hired servants can be procured. A man is obliged to clothe and feed his slave; and he does no more for his servant. The price of the first purchase is, therefore, so much loss to him: not to mention, that the fear of punishment will never draw so much labour from a slave, as the dread of being turned off, and not getting another service, will from a freeman.

¶ Corn. Nepos in vita Attici. We may remark, that Atticus's estate lay chiefly in Epirus, which being a remote, desolate place, would render it profitable for him to rear slaves there.

Athens at least, most of the slaves were imported from foreign countries The Athenians, says Strabo, [Lib vii] gave to their slaves, either the names of the nations whence they were brought, as LYDUS, SYRUS, or the names that were most common among those nations, as MANES, or MIDAS, to a Phrygian, TIBIAS to a Paphlagonian.

Demosthenes, having mentioned a law which forbad any man to strike the slave of another, praises the humanity of this law, and adds, that, if the barbarians, from whom the slaves were bought, had information that their countrymen met with such gentle treatment, they would entertain a great esteem for the Athenians [In Midiam, p 221, ex. edit Aldi] Isocrates [Panegyr] too insinuates, that the slaves of the Greeks were generally or very commonly barbarians. Aristotle in his politics [Lib vii cap 10 sub fin.], plainly supposes, that a slave is always a foreigner The ancient comic writers represented the slaves as speaking a barbarous language* This was an imitation of nature

It is well known that Demosthenes, in his nonage, had been defrauded of a large fortune, by his tutors, and that afterwards he recovered, by a prosecution at law, the value of his patrimony His orations, on that occasion, still remain, and contain an exact detail of the whole substance left by his father [In *Amphobum orat* 1] in money, merchandize, houses, and slaves, together with the value of each particular Among the rest were 52 slaves, handicraftsmen, namely, 32 sword-cutlers, and 20 cabinet-makers,† all males, not a word of any wives, children, or family, which they certainly would have had, had it been a common practice at Athens to breed from the slaves and the value of the whole must have much depended on that circumstance No female slaves are ever so much as mentioned, except some housemaids, who belonged to his mother This argument has great force, if it be not altogether conclusive

Consider this passage of Plutarch, [in vita Catonis], speaking of the Elder Cato 'He had a great number of slaves whom he took care to buy at the sales of prisoners of war, and he chose them young, that they might easily be accustomed to any diet or manner of life, and be instructed in any business or labour, as men teach any thing to young dogs or horses —And esteeming love the chief source of all disorders, he allowed the male slaves to have a commerce with the female in his family, upon paying a certain sum for this privilege but he strictly prohibited all intrigues out of his family' Are there any symptoms in this narration of that care which is supposed in the ancients, of the marriage and propagation of their slaves? If that was a common practice, founded on general interest, it would surely

* Aristoph Equites, l, 17 The ancient scholiast remarks on this passage, *βαρβαρίζει ὡς δοῦλος*

† *κλινοποιοί*, makers of those beds which the ancients lay upon at meals.

have been embraced by Cato, who was a great economist, and lived in times when the ancient frugality and simplicity of manners were still in credit and reputation.

It is expressly remarked by the writers of the Roman law, that scarcely any ever purchase slaves with a view of breeding from them.

Our lackeys and house-maids, I own, do not serve much to multiply their species: but the ancients, besides those who attended on their person, had almost all their labour performed, and even manufactures executed, by slaves, who lived, many of them, in their family; and some great men possessed to the number of 10,000. If there be any suspicion, therefore, that this institution was unfavourable to propagation (and the same reason, at least in part, holds with regard to ancient slaves as modern servants), how destructive must slavery have proved?

History mentions a Roman nobleman, who had 400 slaves under the same roof with him: and having been assassinated at home by the furious revenge of one of them, the law was executed with rigour, and all without exception were put to death. [Tacit. *Ann.* lib. xiv. cap. 43.] Many other Roman noblemen had families equally, or more numerous; and I believe every one will allow, that this would scarcely be practicable, were we to suppose all the slaves married, and the females to be breeders.*

So early as the poet Hesiod,† married slaves, whether male or female, were esteemed inconvenient. How much more, where families had increased to such an enormous size as in Rome, and where the ancient simplicity of manners was banished from all ranks of people?

Xenophon in his Oeconomics, where he gives directions for the management of a farm, recommends a strict care and attention of laying the male and the female slaves at a distance from each other. He seems not to suppose that they are ever married. The only slaves among the Greeks that appear to have continued their own race, were the Helotes, who had houses apart, and were more the slaves of the public than of individuals. [Strabo, lib. viii.]

The same author [De ratione redituum] tells us, that Nicias's overseer, by agreement with his master, was obliged to pay him an obolus a-day for each slave; besides maintaining them, and keeping up the number. Had the ancient slaves been all breeders, this last circumstance of the contract had been superfluous.

The ancients talk so frequently of a fixed, stated portion of provisions assigned to each slave,‡ that we are naturally led to conclude,

* The slaves in the great houses had little rooms assigned them called *cellæ*. Whence the name of cell was transferred to the monk's room in a convent. Just. Lipsius, Saturn. cap. 14. These form strong presumptions against the marriage and propagation of the family slaves.

† Opera et Dies, lib. ii. l. 24, also l. 220.

‡ See Cato de re rustica, cap. 56. Donatus in Phormion, l. 1. c. 9. Senecæ epist. 80.

that slaves lived almost all single, and received that portion as a kind of board wages.

The practice, indeed, of marrying slaves, seems not to have been very common, even among the country labourers, where it is more naturally to be expected. Cato [De re rustic. cap. 10, 11.] enumerating the slaves requisite to labour a vine yard of a hundred acres, makes them amount to 15; the overseer and his wife, *villicus* and *villica*, and 13 male slaves; for an olive plantation of 240 acres, the overseer and his wife, and 11 male slaves; and so in proportion to a greater or less plantation or vineyard.

Varro, [Lib. i. cap. 18.] quoting this passage of Cato, allows his computation to be just in every respect except the last. For as it is requisite, says he, to have an overseer and his wife, whether the vineyard or plantation be great or small, this must alter the exactness of the proportion. Had Cato's computation been erroneous in any other respect, it had certainly been corrected by Varro, who seems fond of discovering so trivial an error.

The same author, [Lib. i. cap. 17.] as well as Columella, [Lib. i. cap. 18.] recommends it as requisite to give a wife to the overseer, in order to attach him the more strongly to his master's service. This was therefore a peculiar indulgence granted to a slave, in whom so great confidence was reposed.

In the same place, Varro mentions it as an useful precaution, not to buy too many slaves from the same nation, lest they beget factions and seditions in the family. A presumption, that in Italy, the greater part, even of the country labouring slaves (for he speaks of no other), were bought from the remoter provinces. All the world knows, that the family slaves in Rome, who were instruments of show and luxury, were commonly imported from the East. *Hoc profecere*, says Pliny, speaking of the jealous care of masters, *mancipiorum legiones, et in domo turba externa, ac servorum quoque causa nomenclator adhibendus.**

It is indeed recommended by Varro [Lib. ii. cap. 10.] to propagate young shepherds in the family from the old ones. For as grazing farms were commonly in remote and cheap places, and each shepherd lived in a cottage apart, his marriage and increase were not liable to the same inconveniences as in dearer places, and where many servants lived in the family; which was universally the case in such of the Roman farms as produced wine or corn. If we consider this exception with regard to shepherds, and weigh the reasons of it, it will serve for a strong confirmation of all our foregoing suspicions.†

Columella, [Lib. i. cap. 8.] I own, advises the master to give a re-

* Lib. xxxiii. cap. 1. So likewise Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. xiv. cap. 44.
† Pastoris duri est hic filius, ille bubulci. Juven. Sat. 11, 151.

ward, and even liberty to a female slave, that had reared him above three children. A proof, that sometimes the ancients propagated from their slaves, which, indeed, cannot be denied. Were it otherwise, the practice of slavery, being so common in antiquity, must have been destructive to a degree which no expedient could repair. All I pretend to infer from these reasonings is, that slavery is in general disadvantageous both to the happiness and populousness of mankind, and that its place is much better supplied by the practice of hired servants.

The laws, or, as some writers call them, the seditions of the Gracchi, were occasioned by their observing the increase of slaves all over Italy, and the diminution of free citizens. Appian* ascribes this increase to the propagation of the slaves: Plutarch† to the purchasing of bargains, who were chained and imprisoned βαρβαρ κα δεσμωτηρια‡. It is to be presumed that both causes concurred.

Sicily, says Florus [Lib. iii. cap. 19.] was full of *ergastula*, and was cultivated by labourers in chains. Eunus and Athenio excited the servile war, by breaking up these monstrous prisons, and giving liberty to 60,000 slaves. The younger Pompey augmented his army in Spain by the same expedient. [Id. lib. iv. cap. 8.] If the country labourers, throughout the Roman empire, were so generally in this situation, and if it was difficult or impossible to find separate lodgings for the families of the city servants, how unfavourable to propagation, as well as to humanity, must the institution of domestic slavery be esteemed?

Constantinople, at present, requires the same recruits of slaves from all the provinces, that Rome did of old; and these provinces are of consequence far from being populous.

Egypt, according to Mons. Maillet, sends continual colonies of black slaves to the other parts of the Turkish empire; and receives annually an equal return of white; the one brought from the inland parts of Africa; the other from Mingrelia, Circassia, and Tartary.

Our modern convents are, no doubt, bad institutions; but there is reason to suspect, that anciently every great family in Italy, and probably in other parts of the world, was a species of convent. And although we have reason to condemn all those popish institutions, as nurseries of superstition, burthensome to the public, and oppressive to

* De bell. civ. lib. i. † In vita Tib. et C. Gracchi.

‡ To the same purpose is that passage in the elder Seneca, ex controversia 5, lib. v. 'Arata quondam populis rura, singulorum ergastulorum sunt; latiusque nunc villici, quam olim reges, imperant. At nunc eadem, says Pliny, 'vincti pedes, damnatae manus, inscripti vultus exercent.' Lib. xviii. cap. 3. So also Martial.

'Et sonat innumera compede Thuscus ager.'—Lib. ix. ep. 23.

And Lucan. 'Tun longos jungere fines
'Agrorum, et quondam duro sulcata Camilli,
'Vomere et antiquas Curiorum passa ligones,
'Longa sub ignotos extendere rura colonis.'—Lib. I.
'Vincto fossore coluntur 'Hesperiae segetes.——' —Lib. vii.

the poor prisoners, male as well as female, yet may it be questioned whether they be so destructive to the populousness of a state, as is commonly imagined. Were the land which belongs to a convent bestowed on a nobleman, he would spend its revenue on dogs, horses, grooms, footmen, cooks, and housemaids, and his family would not furnish many more citizens than the convent.

The common reason why any parent thrusts his daughters into nunneries, is, that he may not be overburthened with too numerous a family, but the ancients had a method almost as innocent, and more effectual to that purpose, to wit, exposing their children in early infancy. This practice was very common, and is not spoken of by any author of those times with the horror it deserves, or scarcely [Tacitus blames it. De morib. Germ.], even with disapprobation. Plutarch, the humane good-natured Plutarch,* mentions it as a merit in Attalus, king of Pergamus, that he murdered, or, if you will, exposed all his own children, in order to leave his crown to the son of his brother Eumenes, signalizing in this manner his gratitude and affection to Eumenes, who had left him his heir preferably to that son. It was Solon, the most celebrated of the sages of Greece, that gave parents permission by law to kill their children. [Sext. Em. lib. iii. cap. 24.]

Shall we then allow these two circumstances to compensate each other, to wit, monastic vows and the exposing of children, and to be unfavourable, in equal degrees, to the propagation of mankind? I doubt the advantage is here on the side of antiquity. Perhaps, by an odd connection of causes, the barbarous practice of the ancients might rather render those times more populous. By removing the terrors of too numerous a family it would engage many people in marriage, and such is the force of natural affection, that very few, in comparison, would have resolution enough, when it came to the push, to carry into execution their former intentions.

China, the only country where this practice of exposing children prevails at present, is the most populous country we know of, and every man is married before he is twenty. Such early marriages could scarcely be general, had not men the prospect of so easy a method of getting rid of their children. I own, that [De amore prolis.] Plutarch speaks of it as a very general maxim of the poor to expose their children, and as the rich were then averse to marriage, on account of the courtship they met with from those who expected legacies from them, the public must have been in a bad situation between them.†

* De fraterno amore. Seneca also approves of the exposing of sickly infirm children. De ira, lib. i. cap. 15.

† The practice of leaving great sums of money to friends, though one had near relations, was common in Greece as well as Rome, as we may gather from Lucian. This practice prevails much less in modern times, and Ben Johnson's VOLPONE is therefore almost entirely extracted from ancient authors, and suits better the manners of those times.

It may justly be thought, that the liberty of divorces in Rome was another discouragement to marriage. Such a practice prevents not quarrels from *humour*, but rather increases

Of all sciences, there is none where first appearances are more deceitful than in politics. Hospitals for foundlings seem favourable to the increase of numbers; and, perhaps, may be so, when kept under proper restrictions. But when they open the door to every one, without distinction, they have probably a contrary effect, and are pernicious to the state. It is computed, that every ninth child born at Paris is sent to the hospital; though it seems certain, according to the common course of human affairs, that it is not a hundredth child whose parents are altogether incapacitated to rear and educate him. The great difference, for health, industry, and morals, between an education in an hospital and that in a private family, should induce us not to make the entrance into the former too easy and engaging. To kill one's own child is shocking to nature, and must therefore be somewhat unusual; but to turn over the care of him upon others, is very tempting to the natural indolence of mankind.

Having considered the domestic life and manners of the ancients, compared to those of the moderns; where, in the main, we seem rather superior, so far as the present question is concerned; we shall now examine the *political* customs and institutions of both ages, and weigh their influence in retarding or forwarding the propagation of mankind.

Before the increase of the Roman power, or rather till its full establishment, almost all the nations, which are the scene of ancient history, were divided into small territories or petty commonwealths, where of course a great equality of fortune prevailed, and the centre of the government was always very near its frontiers.

This was the situation of affairs not only in Greece and Italy, but also in Spain, Gaul, Germany, Afric, and a great part of the Lesser Asia: and it must be owned, that no institution could be more favourable to the propagation of mankind. For though a man of an overgrown fortune, not being able to consume more than another, must share it with those who serve and attend him; yet their possession being precarious, they have not the same encouragement to marry, as if each had a small fortune, secure and independent. Enormous cities are, besides, destructive to society, beget vice and disorder of all kinds, starve the remoter provinces, and even starve themselves, by the prices to which they raise all provisions. Where each man had his little house and field to himself, and each country had its capital, free and independent; what a happy situation of mankind! How favourable to industry and agriculture; to marriage and propagation! The prolific virtue of men, were it to act in its full extent, without that restraint which poverty and necessity impose on it, would double the number every generation: and nothing surely can give it more liberty,

gion; and occasions also those from *interest*, which are much more dangerous and destructive. Perhaps too the unnatural lusts of the ancients ought to be taken into consideration, as of great moment.

than such small commonwealths, and such an equality of fortune among the citizens. All small states naturally produce equality of fortune, because they afford no opportunities of great increase; but small commonwealths much more, by that division of power and authority which is essential to them.

When Xenophon [*De exp. Cyr.* lib. vii.] returned after the famous expedition with Cyrus, he hired himself and 6000 of the Greeks into the service of Seuthes, a prince of Thrace; and the articles of his agreement were, that each soldier should receive a *daric* a month, each captain two *darics*, and he himself, as general, four. A regulation of pay which would not a little surprise our modern officers.

Demosthenes and Æschines, with eight more, were sent ambassadors to Philip of Macedon, and their appointments for above four months were a thousand *drachmas*, which is less than a *drachma* a-day for each ambassador.* But a *drachma* a-day, nay sometimes two [Thucyd. lib. iii.], was the pay of a common foot-soldier.

A centurion among the Romans had only double pay to a private man in Polybius's time [Lib. vi. cap. 37], and we accordingly find the gratuities after a triumph regulated by that proportion.† But Mark Anthony and the triumvirate gave the centurions five times the reward of the other [Appian. *De bell. civ.* lib. iv.]. So much had the increase of the commonwealth increased the inequality among the citizens.‡

It must be owned, that the situation of affairs in modern times, with regard to civil liberty, as well as equality of fortune, is not near so favourable, either to the propagation or happiness of mankind. Europe is shared out mostly into great monarchies; and such parts of it as are divided into small territories are commonly governed by absolute princes, who ruin their people by a mimicry of the great monarchs, in the splendor of their court, and number of their forces. Switzerland alone and Holland resemble the ancient republics; and though the former is far from possessing any advantage, either of soil, climate, or commerce, yet the numbers of people with which it abounds, notwithstanding their enlisting themselves into every service in Europe, prove sufficiently the advantages of their political institutions.

The ancient republics derived their chief or only security from the numbers of their citizens. The Trachinians having lost great numbers of their people, the remainder, instead of enriching themselves by the inheritance of their fellow-citizens, applied to Sparta, their metropolis, for a new stock of inhabitants. The Spartans immediately collected

* Demost. *de falsa leg.* He calls it a considerable sum.

† Tit. Liv. lib. xli. cap. 7, 13, *et alibi passim*.

‡ Cæsar gave the centurions ten times the gratuity of the common soldiers. *De bello Gallico*, lib. viii. In the Rhodian cartel mentioned afterwards, no distinction in the ransom was made on account of ranks in the army.

ten thousand men, among whom the old citizens divided the lands of which the former proprietors had perished [Diod Cyc. lib xii. Thucyd. lib iii.]

After Timoleon had banished Dionysius from Syracuse, and had settled the affairs of Sicily, finding the cities of Syracuse and Sellinuntium extremely depopulated by tyranny, war, and faction, he invited over from Greece some new inhabitants to repeople them. [Diod Sic. lib xvi] Immediately 40,000 men (Plutarch [*In vita* Timol] says 60,000) offered themselves, and he distributed so many lots of land among them, to the great satisfaction of the ancient inhabitants a proof at once of the maxims of ancient policy, which affected populousness more than riches, and of the good effects of these maxims, in the extreme populousness of that small country, Greece, which could at once supply so great a colony The case was not much different with the Romans in early times He is a pernicious citizen, said M Curius, who cannot be content with seven* acres Such ideas of equality could not fail of producing great numbers of people

We must now consider what disadvantages the ancients lay under with regard to populousness, and what checks they received from their political maxims and institutions There are commonly compensations in every human condition, and though these compensations be not always perfectly equal, yet they serve, at least, to restrain the prevailing principle To compare them, and estimate their influence, is indeed difficult, even where they take place in the same age, and in neighbouring countries but where several ages have intervened, and only scattered lights are afforded us by ancient authors, what can we do but amuse ourselves by talking *pro* and *con*, on an interesting subject, and thereby correcting all hasty and violent determinations?

I We may observe, that the ancient republics were almost in perpetual war, a natural effect of their martial spirit, their love of liberty, their mutual emulation, and that hatred which generally prevails among nations that live in close neighbourhood Now, war in a small state is much more destructive than in a great one, both because all the inhabitants, in the former case, must serve in the armies, and because the whole state is frontier, and is all exposed to the inroads of the enemy

The maxims of ancient war were much more destructive than those of modern, chiefly by that distribution of plunder, in which the soldiers were indulged. The private men in our armies are such a low set of people, that we find any abundance, beyond their simple pay, breeds

* Plin lib. xviii. cap 3. The same author, in cap. 6. says, *Verumque fatentibus latifundia perdidere Italiam, jam vero et provincias Sex domi semissem Africæ possidebant, cum interfecit eos Nero princeps* In this view, the barbarous butchery committed by the first Roman emperors, was not, perhaps, so destructive to the public as we may imagine These never ceased till they had extinguished all the illustrious families, which had enjoyed the plunder of the world, during the latter ages of the republic The new nobles who rose in their place were less splendid, as we learn from Tacit.—*Ann. lib* iii. *cap* 55.

confusion and disorder among them, and a total dissolution of discipline. The very wretchedness and meanness of those who fill the modern armies, render them less destructive to the countries which they invade one instance, among many, of the deceitfulness of first appearances in all political reasonings *

Ancient battles were much more bloody, by the very nature of the weapons employed in them The ancients drew up their men 16 or 20, sometimes 50 men deep, which made a narrow front, and it was not difficult to find a field, in which both armies might be marshalled, and might engage with each other Even where any body of the troops was kept off by hedges, hillocks, woods, or hollow ways, the battle was not so soon decided between the contending parties, but that the others had time to overcome the difficulties which opposed them, and take part in the engagement And as the whole army was thus engaged, and each man closely buckled to his antagonist, the battles were commonly very bloody, and great slaughter was made on both sides, especially on the vanquished The long thin lines, required by fire arms, and the quick decision of the fray, render our modern engagements but partial rencounters, and enable the general, who is foiled in the beginning of the day, to draw off the greater part of his army, sound and entire

The battles of antiquity, both by their duration and their resemblance to single combats, were wrought up to a degree of fury quite unknown to later ages Nothing could then engage the combatants to give quarter, but the hopes of profit, by making slaves of their prisoners In civil wars, as we learn from Tacitus [Hist lib ii cap 4] the battles were the most bloody, because the prisoners were not slaves

What a stout resistance must be made, where the vanquished expected so hard a fate How inveterate the rage, where the maxims of war were, in every respect, so bloody and severe?

Instances are frequent, in ancient history, of cities besieged, whose inhabitants, rather than open their gates, murdered their wives and children, and rushed themselves on a voluntary death, sweetened perhaps by a little prospect of revenge upon the enemy Greeks,† as well as Barbarians, have often been wrought up to this degree of fury And the same determined spirit and cruelty must, in other instances less remarkable, have been destructive to human society, in those petty commonwealths, which lived in close neighbourhood, and were engaged in perpetual wars and contentions

Sometimes the wars in Greece, says Plutarch [In *vita* Arati] were

* The ancient soldiers, being free citizens, above the lowest rank, were all married Our modern soldiers are either forced to live unmarried or their marriages turn to small account towards the increase of mankind. A circumstance which ought, perhaps, to be taken into consideration, as of some consequence in favour of the ancients

† As Abydus, mentioned by Livy, lib xxxi. cap. 17, 18, and Polyb. lib. xvi. As also the Xanthians, Appian, *de bell civil.* lib. iv

carried on entirely by inroads, and robberies, and piracies. Such a method of war must be more destructive in small states, than the bloodiest battles and sieges.

By the laws of the twelve tables, possession during two years formed a prescription for land, one year for moveables [Inst lib ii cap 6] an indication, that there was not in Italy, at that time, much more order, tranquillity, and settled police, than there is at present among the Tartar tribes

The only cartel I remember in ancient history, is that between Demetrius Poliorcetes and the Rhodians, when it was agreed, that a free citizen should be restored for 1000 *drachmas*, a slave bearing arms for 500 [Diod Sicul lib xx]

II It appears that ancient manners were more unfavourable than the modern, not only in times of war, but also in those of peace, and that too in every respect, except the love of civil liberty and of equality which is, I own, of considerable importance To exclude faction from a free government, is very difficult, if not altogether impracticable, but such inveterate rage between the factions, and such bloody maxims, are found, in modern times, amongst religious parties alone. In ancient history we may always observe, where one party prevailed, whether the nobles or people (for I can observe no difference in this respect,) * that they immediately butchered all of the opposite party who fell into their hands, and banished such as had been so fortunate as to escape their fury No form of process no law, no trial, no pardon A fourth, a third, perhaps near half of the city was slaughtered, or expelled, every revolution, and the exiles always joined foreign enemies, and did all the mischief possible to their fellow-citizens, till fortune put it in their power to take full revenge by a new revolution And as these were frequent in such violent governments, the disorder, diffidence, jealousy, enmity, which must prevail, are not easy for us to imagine in this age of the world

There are only two revolutions I can recollect in ancient history, which passed without great severity, and great effusion of blood in massacres and assassinations, namely, the restoration of the Athenian Democracy by Thrasybulus, and the subduing of the Roman republic by Cæsar We learn from ancient history, that Thrasybulus passed a general amnesty for all past offences, and first introduced that word, as well as practice, into Greece [Cicero, Philip 1] It appears, however, from many orations of Lysias,† that the chief, and even some of the subaltern offenders, in the preceding tyranny, were tried and capitally punished. And as to Cæsar's clemency, though much celebrated, it would not gain great applause in the present age. He

* Lysias, who was himself of the popular faction, and very narrowly escaped from the thirty tyrants, says, that the Democracy was as violent a government as the Oligarchy.—*Orat.* 24, *de statu popul.*

† As *orat.* 11, *contra* Eratost. *orat.* 12, *contra* Agorat. *orat.* [illegible] Mantith.

butchered, for instance, all Cato's senate, when he became master of Utica [Appian *de bel civ* lib ii] and these, we may readily believe, were not the most worthless of the party All those who had borne arms against that usurper, were attainted, and, by Hirtius's law, declared incapable of all public offices,

These people were extremely fond of liberty, but seem not to have understood it very well When the thirty tyrants first established their dominion at Athens, they began with seizing all the sycophants and informers, who had been so troublesome during the democracy, and putting them to death by an arbitrary sentence and execution *Every man*, says Sallust [Cæsar's speech *de bel Catil*] and Lysias,* *rejoiced at these punishments*, not considering that liberty was from that moment annihilated

The utmost energy of the nervous style of Thucydides, and the copiousness and expression of the Greek language, seem to sink under that historian, when he attempts to discribe the disorders, which arose from faction throughout all the Grecian commonwealths You would imagine, that he still labours with a thought greater than he can find words to communicate And he concludes his pathetic description with an observation, which is at once refined and solid 'In 'these contests,' says he, 'those who were the dullest and most stupid, 'and had the least foresight, commonly prevailed For being conscious 'of this weakness, and dreading to be over reached by those of greater 'penetration, they went to work hastily, without premeditation, by the 'sword and poniard, and thereby got the start of their antagonists, who 'were forming fine schemes and projects for their destruction' [Thucydides, Lib iii]

Not to mention Dionysius [Plut de *virt & fort* Alex] the elder who is computed to have butchered in cold blood above 10,000 of his fellow-citizens or Agathocles, [Diod Sic lib xviii, xix.] Nabis, [Tit. Liv xxxi, xxxiii, xxxiv] and others, still more bloody than he, the transactions, even in free governments, were extremely violent and destructive At Athens, the thirty tyrants and the nobles, in a twelvemonth, murdered, without trial, about 1200 of the people, and banished above the half of the citizens that remained † In Argos, near the same time, the people killed 1200 of the nobles, and afterwards their own demagogues, because they had refused to carry their prosecutions farther [Diod Sic lib xv] The people also in Corcyra killed 1500 of the nobles, and banished a thousand [Diod. Sic. lib xiii] These numbers will appear the more surprising, if we consider the extreme

* *Orat* 24. And in *orat* 29, he mentions the factious spirit of the popular assemblies as the only cause why these illegal punishments should displease.

† Diod. Sic. lib xvi. Isocrates says, there were only 5000 banished. He makes the number of those killed amount to 1500 Areop Æschines *contra* Ctesiph. assigns precisely the same number. Seneca (*de tranq anim.*) cap. v says 13,000.

smallness of these states. But all ancient history will be found full of such circumstances *

When Alexander ordered all the exiles to be restored throughout all the cities, it was found, that the whole amounted to 20,000 men; [Diod. Sic lib xviii] the remains probably of still greater slaughters and massacres What an astonishing multitude in so narrow a country as ancient Greece! And what domestic confusion, jealousy, partiality, revenge, heart-burnings, must tear those cities, where factions were wrought up to such a degree of fury and despair!

It would be easier, says Isocrates to Philip, to raise an army in Greece at present from the vagabonds than from the cities

Even when affairs came not to such extremities (which they failed not to do almost in every city twice or thrice every century), property was rendered very precarious by the maxims of ancient government Xenophon, in the Banquet of Socrates, gives us a natural unaffected description of the tyranny of the Athenian people 'In my poverty,' says Charmides, 'I am much more happy than I ever was while possessed of riches as much as it is happier to be in security than in terrors, free than a slave, to receive than to pay court, to be trusted than suspected Formerly I was obliged to caress every informer, some imposition was continually laid upon me, and it was never allowed me to travel, or be absent from the city At present, when I am poor, I look big, and threaten others The rich are afraid of me, and show me every kind of civility and respect, and I am become a kind of tyrant in the city' [P 885 *ex ed* Leunclay]

In one of the pleadings of Lysia, [*Orat* 29, *in* Nicom] the orator very coolly speaks of it, by the bye, as a maxim of the Athenian people, that whenever they wanted money, they put to death some of the rich citizens as well as strangers, for the sake of the forfeiture. In

* We shall mention from Diodorus Siculus alone a few massacres, which passed in the course of sixty years during the most shining age of Greece There were banished from Sybaris 300 of the nobles and their partizans lib xii p 77 *ex edit Rhodomanni* Of Chians, 600 citizens banished lib xiii p 180. At Ephesus 340 killed 1000 banished lib xiii p 223. Of Cyrenians, 500 nobles killed all the rest banished lib xiv p 263 The Corinthians killed 120 banished 500 lib xiv p. 304 Phæbidas the Spartan banished 300 Bœotians lib xv p 342 Upon the fall of the Lacedemonians, democracies were restored in many cities, and severe vengeance taken of the nobles, after the Greek manner But matters did not end there For the banished nobles returning in many places, butchered their adversaries at Phialæ, in Corinth, in Megara, in Phliasia In this last place they killed 300 of the people but these again revolting killed above 600 of the nobles, and banished the rest lib. xv p 357 In Arcadia 1400 banished besides many killed. The banished retired to Sparta and to Paliartium The latter were delivered up to their countrymen and all killed, lib. xv p 373 Of the banished from Argos and Thebes, there were 500 in the Spartan army *id* p 374 Here is a detail of the most remarkable of Agathocles cruelties from the same author The people before his usurpation had banished 600 nobles lib. 19 p 655 Afterwards that tyrant in concurrence with the people, killed 4000 nobles, and banished 6000 *id* p. 647 He killed 4000 people at Gela *id* p. 741. by Agathocles' brother 8000 banished from Syracuse lib xx. p 757 The inhabitants of Ægesta to the number of 40,000, were killed, man woman, and child and with tortures, for the sake of their money *id* p. 802 All the relations, to wit, father, brother, children grandfather, of his Libyan army, killed *id* p 803 He killed 7000 exiles after capitulation *id*, p. 816. It is to be remarked, that Agathocles was a man of great sense and courage, and is not to be suspected of wanton cruelty, contrary to the maxims of his age.

mentioning this, he seems not to have any intention of blaming them, still less of provoking them, who were his audience and judges

Whether a man was a citizen or a stranger among that people, it seems indeed requisite, either that he should impoverish himself, or that the people would impoverish him, and perhaps kill him into the bargain The orator last mentioned gives a pleasant account of an estate laid out in the public service * that is, above the third of it in raree-shows and figured dances

I need not insist on the Greek tyrannies, which were altogether horrible Even the mixed monarchies, by which most of the ancient states of Greece were governed, before the introduction of republics, were very unsettled Scarcely any city, but Athens, says Isocrates, could show a succession of kings for four or five generations

Besides many other obvious reasons for the instability of ancient monarchies, the equal division of property among the brothers of private families, must, by a necessary consequence, contribute to unsettle and disturb the state The universal preference given to the elder by modern laws, though it increases the inequality of fortunes, has, however, this good effect, that it accustoms men to the same idea in public succession, and cuts off all claim and pretension of the younger brethren

The new settled colony of Heraclea, falling immediately into faction, applied to Sparta, who sent Heripidas with full authority to quiet their dissentions This man, not provoked by any opposition, not inflamed by party rage, knew no better expedient than immediately putting to death about five hundred of the citizens [Diod Sic lib xvi] A strong proof how deeply rooted these violent maxims of government were throughout all Greece

If such was the disposition of men's minds among that refined people, what may be expected in the commonwealth's of Italy, Afric, Spain, and Gaul, which were denominated barbarous? Why otherwise did the Greeks so much value themselves on their humanity,

* In order to recommend his client to the favour of the people, he enumerates all the sums he had expended when χορηγος 30 minas. Upon a chorus of men 20 minas εισπυρριχισταις, 8 minas ανδρασ χορηγων, 50 minas κυκλικω χωρω 3 minas seven times trierarch where he spent 6 talents taxes, once 30 minas another time 40 γυμνασιαρχων, 12 minas χορηγος παιδικω χωρω, 15 minas κομωδοις χορηγων, 18 mina πυρριχισταις, αγενειοις 7 minas τριηρει αμιλλωμενος, 15 minas αρχηθεωρος 30 minas in the whole ten talents 38 minas An immense sum for an Athenian fortune and what alone would be esteemed great riches *Orat* 20 It is true, he says the law did not oblige him absolutely to be at so much expence not above a fourth But without the favour of the people, nobody was so much as safe and this was the only way to gain it See farther *orat* 24, *de pop statu* In another place, he introduces a speaker, who says that he had spent his whole fortune, and an immense one, eighty talents, for the people *Orat* 25 *ac Prob Evandri* The μετοικοι, or strangers, find, says he, if they do not contribute largely enough to the people's fancy, that they have reason to repent it *Orat* 30 *contra Phil* You may see with what care Demosthenes displays his expenses of this nature when he pleads for himself *de corona*, and how he exaggerates Midias stinginess in this particular, in his accusation of that criminal All this, by the bye, is a mark of a very iniquitous judicature and yet the Athenians valued themselves on having the most legal and regular administration of any people in Greece.

gentleness, and moderation, above all other nations? This reasoning seems very natural But unluckily the history of the Roman commonwealth, in its earlier times, if we give credit to the received accounts, presents an opposite conclusion No blood was ever shed in any sedition at Rome, till the murder of the Gracchi Dionysius Halicarnassæus, [Lib 1] observing the singular humanity of the Roman people in this particular, makes use of it as an argument that they were originally of Grecian extraction whence we may conclude, that the factions and revolutions in the barbarous republics, were usually more violent than even those of Greece above mentioned

If the Romans were so late in coming to blows, they made ample compensation, after they had once entered upon the bloody scene, and Appian's history of their civil wars contains the most frightful picture of massacres, proscriptions, and forfeitures, that ever was presented to the world What pleases most, in that historian, is, that he seems to feel a proper resentment of these barbarous proceedings, and talks not with that provoking coolness and indifference, which custom had produced in many of the Greek historians *

The maxims of ancient politics contain, in general, so little humanity and moderation, that it seems superfluous to give any particular reason for the acts of violence committed at any particular period Yet I cannot forbear observing, that the laws, in the later period of the Roman commonwealth, were so absurdly contrived, that they obliged the heads of parties to have recourse to these extremities All capital punishments were abolished however criminal, or what is more, however dangerous any citizen might be, he could not regularly be punished otherwise than by banishment and it became necessary, in the revolutions of party, to draw the sword of private vengeance, nor was it easy, when laws were once violated, to set bounds to these sanguinary proceedings Had Brutus himself prevailed over the *triumvirate*, could he, in common prudence, have allowed Octavius and Anthony to live, and have contented himself with banishing them to Rhodes or Marseilles, where they might still have plotted new commotions and rebellions? His executing C Antonius, brother to the

* The authorities above cited are all historians, orators and philosophers whose testimony is unquestioned. It is dangerous to rely upon writers who deal in ridicule and satire What will posterity, for instance infer from this passage of Dr Swift? 'I told him that in 'the kingdom of Tribnia (Britain) by the natives called Langdon (London) where I had 'sojourned some time in my travels the bulk of the people consist, in a manner, wholly of 'discoverers, witnesses informers, accusers, prosecutors evidences, swearers together with 'their several subservient and subaltern instruments all under the colours the conduct, and 'pay of ministers of state and their deputies The plots in that kingdom are usually the 'workmanship of those persons &c —*Gulliver's Travels* Such a representation might suit the government of Athens not that of England, which is remarkable even in modern times, for humanity, justice, and liberty Yet the Doctor's satire, though carried to extremes, as is usual with him even beyond other satirical writers, did not altogether want an object The Bishop of Rochester, who was his friend and of the same party, had been banished a little before by a bill of attainder, with great justice, but without such proof as was legal, or according to the strict forms of common law

triumvir, shows evidently his sense of the matter. Did not Cicero, with the approbation of all the wise and virtuous of Rome, arbitrarily put to death Catiline's accomplices, contrary to law, and without any trial or form of process? and if he moderated his executions, did it not proceed, either from the clemency of his temper, or the conjunctures of the times? A wretched security in a government which pretends to laws and liberty!

Thus, one extreme produces another In the same manner, as excessive severity in the laws is apt to beget great relaxation in their execution, so their excessive lenity naturally produces cruelty and barbarity It is dangerous to force us, in any case, to pass their sacred boundaries

One general cause of the disorders, so frequent in all ancient governments, seems to have consisted in the great difficulty of establishing any aristocracy in those ages, and the perpetual discontents and seditions of the people, whenever even the meanest and most beggarly were excluded from the legislature and from public offices The very quality of *freemen* gave such a rank, being opposed to that of slave, that it seemed to entitle the possessor to every power and privilege of the commonwealth, Solon's [Plutarchus *in vita* Solon] laws excluded no freeman from votes or elections, but confined some magistracies to a particular *census*, yet were the people never satisfied till those laws were repealed By the treaty with Antipater [Diod Sic. lib xviii] no Athenian was allowed a vote whose *census* was less than 2000 *drachmas* (about £60 *Sterling*) And though such a government would to us appear sufficiently democratical, it was so disagreeable to that people, that above two-thirds of them immediately left their country [Id. ibid] Cassander reduced that *census* to the half [Id ibid.] yet still the government was considered as an oligarchical tyranny, and the effect of foreign violence

Servius Tullius's [Tit Liv lib 1 cap 43] laws seem equal and reasonable, by fixing the power in proportion to the property yet the Roman people could never be brought quietly to submit to them.

In those days there was no medium between a severe, jealous aristocracy, ruling over discontented subjects; and a turbulent, factious, tyrannical democracy At present, there is not one republic in Europe, from one extremity of it to the other, that is not remarkable for justice, lenity, and stability, equal to, or even beyond Marseilles, Rhodes, or the most celebrated in antiquity. Almost all of them are well-tempered aristocracies

III There are many other circumstances, in which ancient nations seem inferior to the modern, both for the happiness and increase of mankind. Trade, manufactures, industry, were no where, in former ages, so flourishing as they are at present in Europe The only garb of the ancients, both for males and females, seems to have been a kind

of flannel, which they wore commonly white or grey, and which they scoured as often as it became dirty. Tyre, which carried on, after Carthage, the greatest commerce of any city in the Mediterranean, before it was destroyed by Alexander, was no mighty city, if we credit Arrian's account of its inhabitants.* Athens is commonly supposed to have been a trading city: but it was as populous before the Median war as at any time after it, according to Herodotus;† yet its commerce, at that time, was so inconsiderable, that, as the same historian observes [lib. v.] even the neighbouring coasts of Asia were as little frequented by the Greeks as the pillars of Hercules: for beyond these he conceived nothing.

Great interest of money, and great profits of trade, are an infallible indication, that industry and commerce are but in their infancy. We read in Lysias [*Orat.* 33. *advers.* Diagit.] of 100 *per cent.* profit made on a cargo of two talents, sent to no greater distance than from Athens to the Adriatic: nor is this mentioned as an instance of extraordinary profit. Antidorus, says Demosthenes [*Contra* Aphob. p. 25. *ex edit.* Aldi.], paid three talents and a half for a house which he let at a talent a year: and the orator blames his own tutors for not employing his money to like advantage. My fortune, says he, in eleven years minority, ought to have been tripled. The value of 20 of the slaves left by his father, he computes at 40 minas, and the yearly profit of their labour at 12. [Id. p. 19.] The most moderate interest at Athens (for there was higher [Id. ibid.] often paid) was 12 *per cent.* [Id. ibid. and Æschines *contra* Ctesiph.], and that paid monthly. Not to insist upon the high interest, to which the vast sums distributed in elections had raised money [*Epist. ad* Attic. lib. iv. epist. 15.] at Rome, we find, that Verres, before that factious period, stated 24 *per cent.* for money which he left in the hands of the publicans: and though Cicero exclaims against this article, it is not on account of the extravagant usury; but because it had never been customary to state any interest on such occasions. [*Con.* Verr. *or.* 3.] Interest, indeed, sunk at Rome, after the settlement of the empire: but it never remained any considerable time so low as in the commercial states of modern times.‡

Among the other inconveniences which the Athenians felt from the fortifying of Decelia by the Lacedemonians, it is represented by Thucydides, [Lib. vii.] as one of the most considerable, that they could not bring over their corn from Eubea by land, passing by Oropus, but were obliged to embark it, and to sail round the promontory of

* Lib. ii. There were 8000 killed during the siege, and the captives amounted to 30,000. Diodorus Siculus, lib. xvii. says only 13,000: but he accounts for this small number, by saying that the Tyrians had sent away before-hand part of their wives and children to Carthage.

† Lib. v. he makes the number of citizens amount to 30,000.

‡ See Essay XXVI.

Sunium. A surprising instance of the imperfection of ancient navigation! For the water-carriage is not here above double the land.

* I do not remember a passage in any ancient author, where the growth of a city is ascribed to the establishment of a manufacture The commerce, which is said to flourish, is chiefly the exchange of those commodities, for which different soils and climates were suited The sale of wine and oil into Africa, according to Diodorus Siculus [Lib xiii] was the foundation of the riches of Agrigentum The situation of the city of Sybaris, according to the same author [Lib xii] was the cause of its immense populousness, being built near the two rivers Crathys and Sybaris But these two rivers, we may observe, are not navigable, and could only produce some fertile valleys, for agriculture and tillage, an advantage so inconsiderable, that a modern writer would scarcely have taken notice of it

The barbarity of the ancient tyrants, together with the extreme love of liberty, which animated those ages, must have banished every merchant and manufacturer, and have quite depopulated the state, had it subsisted upon industry and commerce While the cruel and suspicious Dionysius was carrying on his butcheries, who, that was not detained by his landed property, and could have carried with him any art or skill to procure a subsistence in other countries, would have remained exposed to such implacable barbarity? The persecutions of Philip II and Lewis XIV filled all Europe with the manufactures of Flanders and of France

I grant, that agriculture is the species of industry chiefly requisite to the subsistence of multitudes, and it is possible, that this industry may flourish, even where manufactures and other arts are unknown and neglected Switzerland is at present a remarkable instance, where we find, at once, the most skilful husbandmen, and the most bungling tradesmen, that are to be met with in Europe That agriculture flourished in Greece and Italy, at least in some parts of them, and at some periods, we have reason to presume, and whether the mechanical arts had reached the same degree of perfection, may not be esteemed so material, especially, if we consider the great equality of riches in the ancient republics, where each family was obliged to cultivate, with the greatest care and industry, its own little field, in order to its subsistence

But is it just reasoning, because agriculture may, in some instances, flourish without trade or manufactures, to conclude that, in any great extent of country, and for any great tract of time, it would subsist alone? The most natural way, surely, of encouraging husbandry is, first, to excite other kinds of industry, and thereby afford the labourer a ready market for his commodities, and a return for such goods as may contribute to his pleasure and enjoyment This method is infallible and universal, and, as it prevails more in modern govern-

ments than in the ancient, it affords a presumption of the superior populousness of the former

Every man, says Xenophon, [Oecon] may be a farmer no art or skill is requisite all consists in industry, and in attention to the execution A strong proof, as Columella hints, that agriculture was but little known in the age of Xenophon

All our later improvements and refinements, have they done nothing towards the easy subsistence of men, and consequently towards their propagation and increase? Our superior skill in mechanics, the discovery of new worlds, by which commerce has been so much enlarged, the establishment of posts, and the use of bills of exchange these seem all extremely useful to the encouragement of art, industry, and populousness Were we to strike off these, what a check should we give to every kind of business and labour, and what multitudes of families would immediately perish from want and hunger? And it seems not probable, that we could supply the place of these new inventions by any other regulation or institution

Have we reason to think, that the police of ancient states was any wise comparable to that of modern, or that men had then equal security, either at home, or in their journies by land and water? I question not, but every impartial examiner would give us the preference in this particular *

Thus, upon comparing the whole, it seems impossible to assign any just reason, why the world should have been more populous in ancient than in modern times The equality of property among the ancients, liberty, and the small divisions of their states were indeed circumstances favourable to the propagation of mankind but their wars were more bloody and destructive, their governments more factious and unsettled, commerce and manufactures more feeble and languishing, and the general police more loose and irregular These latter disadvantages, seem to form a sufficient counterbalance to the former advantages and rather favour the opposite opinion to that which commonly prevails with regard to this subject

But there is no reasoning it may be said, against matter of fact If it appear, that the world was then more populous than at present, we may be assured, that our conjectures are false, and that we have overlooked some material circumstance in the comparison. This I readily own all our preceeding reasonings I acknowledge to be mere trifling, or, at least, small skirmishes and frivolous rencounters, which decide nothing But unluckily the main combat, where we compare facts, cannot be rendered much more decisive The facts delivered by ancient authors, are either so uncertain or so imperfect as to afford us nothing positive in this matter How indeed could it be

* See Essay X.

otherwise? The very facts, which we must oppose to them, in computing the populousness of modern states, are far from being either certain or complete. Many grounds of calculation proceeded on by celebrated writers are little better than those of the emperor Heliogabalus, who formed an estimate of the immense greatness of Rome from ten thousand pounds weight of cobwebs which had been found in that city. [Ælii Lamprid. *in vita* Heliogab. cap. 26.]

It is to be remarked, that all kinds of numbers are uncertain in ancient manuscripts, and have been subject to much greater corruptions, than any other part of the text, and that for an obvious reason. Any alteration, in other places, commonly affects the sense or grammar, and is more readily perceived by the reader and the transcriber.

Few enumerations of inhabitants have been made of any tract of country by any ancient author of good authority, so as to afford us a large enough view for comparison.

It is probable that there was formerly a good foundation for the number of citizens assigned to any free city, because they entered for a share in the government, and there were exact registers kept of them. But as the number of slaves is seldom mentioned, this leaves us in as great uncertainty as ever with regard to the populousness even of single cities.

The first page of Thucydides is, in my opinion, the commencement of real history. All preceding narrations are so intermixed with fable, that philosophers ought to abandon them, in a great measure, to the embellishment of poets and orators.

With regard to remote times, the number of people assigned are often ridiculous, and lose all credit and authority. The free citizens of Sybaris, able to bear arms, and actually drawn out in battle were 300,000. They encountered at Siagra with 100,000 citizens of Crotona another Greek city contiguous to them, and were defeated. This is Diodorus Siculus' [Lib. xii.] account, and is very seriously insisted on by that historian. Strabo [Lib. vi.] also mentions the same number of Sybarites.

Diodorus Siculus, [Lib. xiii.] enumerating the inhabitants of Agrigentum, when it was destroyed by the Carthaginians, says that they amounted to 20,000 citizens, 200,000 strangers, beside slaves, who, in so opulent a city as he represents it, would probably be at least as numerous. We must remark, that therefore, upon the whole, this city must have contained near two millions of inhabitants.* And what was the reason of so immense an increase? They were industrious in cultivating the neighbouring fields, not exceeding a small English county;

* Diogenes Laertius (*in vita* Empedoclis) says, that Agrigentum contained only 800,000 inhabitants.

and they traded with their wine and oil to Africa, which at that time produced none of these commodities.

Ptolemy, says Theocritus, [Idyll. 17.] commands 33,339 cities. I suppose the singularity of the number was the reason of assigning it. Diodorus Siculus [Lib. 1.] assigns three millions of inhabitants to Egypt, a small number: but then he makes the number of cities amount to 18,000: an evident contradiction.

He says, [Idyll. 17.] the people were formerly seven millions. Thus remote times are always most envied and admired.

That Xerxes' army was extremely numerous, I can readily believe, both from the great extent of his empire, and from the practice among the eastern nations, of encumbering their camp with a superfluous multitude: but will any rational man cite Herodotus' wonderful narrations as any authority? There is something very rational, I own, in Lysias' [*Orat. de funebris.*] argument upon this subject. Had not Xerxes' army been incredibly numerous, says he, he had never made a bridge over the Hellespont: it had been much easier to have transported his men over so short a passage with the numerous shipping of which he was master.

Polybius says [Lib. ii.] that the Romans, between the first and second Punic wars, being threatened with an invasion from the Gauls, mustered all their own forces and those of their allies, and found them amount to seven hundred thousand men able to bear arms: a great number surely, and which, when joined to the slaves, is probably not less, if not rather more, than that extent of country affords at present.* The enumeration too seems to have been made with some exactness; and Polybius gives us the detail of the particulars. But might not the number be magnified, in order to encourage the people?

Diodorus Siculus [Lib. ii.] makes the same enumeration amount to near a million. These variations are suspicious. He plainly too supposes, that Italy, in his time, was not so populous: another suspicious circumstance. For who can believe, that the inhabitants of that country diminished from the time of the first Punic war to that of the *triumvirates*?

Julius Cæsar, according to Appian, [Celtica.] encountered four millions of Gauls, killed one million, and made another million prisoners.† Supposing the number of the enemy's army and that of the slain could be exactly assigned, which never is possible, how could it be known how often the same man returned into the armies, or how distinguish the new from the old levied soldiers? No atten-

* The country that supplied this number was not above a third of Italy, viz. the Pope's dominions, Tuscany, and a part of the kingdom of Naples: but perhaps, in those early times, there were very few slaves, except in Rome, or the great cities.

† Plutarch (*in vita Cæs.*) makes the number that Cæsar fought with amount to three millions; Julian (*in Cæsaribus*) to two.

tion ought ever to be given to such loose, exaggerated calculations, especially where the author does not tell us the mediums upon which the calculations were founded.

Paterculus [Lib. ii. cap. 47.] makes the number of Gauls killed by Cæsar amount only to 400,000: a more probable account, and more easily reconciled to the history of these wars given by that conqueror himself in his Commentaries.* The most bloody of his battles were fought against the Helvetii and the Germans.

One would imagine, that every circumstance of the life and actions of Dionysius the elder might be regarded as authentic, and free from all fabulous exaggeration; both because he lived at a time when letters flourished most in Greece, and because his chief historian was Philistus, a man allowed to be of great genius, and who was a courtier and minister of that prince. But can we admit, that he had a standing army of 100,000 foot, 10,000 horse, and a fleet of 400 galleys? [Diod. Sic. lib. ii.] These, we may observe, were mercenary forces, and subsisted upon pay, like our armies in Europe. For the citizens were all disarmed; and when Dion afterwards invaded Sicily, and called on his countrymen to vindicate their liberty, he was obliged to bring arms along with him, which he distributed among those who joined him. [Plutarch *in vita* Dionys.] In a state where agriculture alone flourishes, there may be many inhabitants; and if these be all armed and disciplined, a great force may be called out upon occasion: but great bodies of mercenary troops can never be maintained, without either great trade and numerous manufactures, or extensive dominions. The united provinces never were masters of such a force by sea and land, as that which is said to belong to Dionysius; yet they possess as large a territory, perfectly well cultivated, and have much more resources from their commerce and industry. Diodorus Siculus allows, that, even in his time, the army of Dionysius appeared incredible; that is, as I interpret it, was entirely a fiction; and the opinion arose from the exaggerated flattery of the courtiers, and perhaps from the vanity and policy of the tyrant himself.

It is a usual fallacy, to consider all the ages of antiquity as one period, and to compute the numbers contained in the great cities mentioned by ancient authors, as if these cities had been all cotemporary. The Greek colonies flourished extremely in Sicily during the age of Alexander: but in Augustus' time they were so decayed, that almost all the produce of that fertile island was consumed in Italy. [Strabo, lib. vi.]

Let us now examine the numbers of the inhabitants assigned to par-

* Pliny, lib. vii. cap. 25. says, that Cæsar used to boast, that there had fallen in battle against him 1,192,000, besides those who perished in the civil wars. It is not probable that that conqueror could ever pretend to be so exact in his computation. But allowing the fact, it is likely that the Helvetii, Germans, and Britons, whom he slaughtered, would amount to near a half of the number.

ticular cities in antiquity and omitting the numbers of Nineveh, Babylon, and the Egyptian Thebes, let us confine ourselves to the sphere of real history, to the Grecian and Roman states I must own the more I consider this subject, the more am I inclined to scepticism, with regard to the great populousness ascribed to ancient times

Athens is said by Plato [*Apolog* Socr] to be a very great city, and it was surely the greatest of all the Greek* cities, except Syracuse, which was nearly about the same size in Thucydides' [Lib vi and Plutarch *in vita* Niciæ] time, and afterwards increased beyond it For Cicero† mentions it as the greatest of all the Greek cities in his time, not comprehending, I suppose, either Antioch or Alexandria under that denomination Athenæus [Lib vi cap 20] says, that by the enumeration of Demetrius Phalereus, there were in Athens 21,000 citizens, 10,000 strangers, and 400,000 slaves This number is much insisted on by those whose opinion I call in question, and is esteemed a fundamental fact to their purpose but, in my opinion, there is no point of criticism more certain, than that Athenæus and Ctesicles, whom he quotes, are here mistaken, and that the number of slaves is augmented by a whole cypher, and ought not to be regarded as more than 40,000

I When the number of citizens are said to be 21,000 by Athenæus,‡ men full of age are only understood For, 1 Herodotus says, [Lib v] that Aristagoras, ambassador from the Ionians, found it harder to deceive one Spartan than 30,000 Athenians, meaning, in a loose way, the whole state, supposed to be met in one popular assembly, excluding the women and children 2 Thucydides [Lib viii], says, that making allowance for all the absentees in the fleet, army, garrisons, and for people employed in their private affairs, the Athenian assembly never rose to five thousand 3 The forces, enumerated by the same historian,§ being all citizens, and amounting to 13,000 heavy-armed infantry, prove the same method of calculation, as also the whole tenor of the Greek historians, who always understand men of full age, when they assign the number of citizens in any republic Now, these being but the fourth of the inhabitants, the free Athenians were by this account 84,000, the strangers, 40,000, and the slaves, calculated by the smaller number, and allowing that they married and propagated at the same rate with freemen, were 160,000, and the whole of the inhabitants 284,000 a number surely large enough The other number, 1,720,000, makes Athens larger than London and Paris united.

II There were but 10,000 houses in Athens [Xenophon *Mem* lib ii]

III Though the extent of the walls, as given us by Thucydides,

* Argos seems also to have been a great city, for Lycias contents himself with saying that it did not exceed Athens. Orat. 34.

† *Orat contra* Verrem lib iv cap. 52. Strabo, lib. vi says, it was twenty-two miles in compass, But then we are to consider that it contained two harbours within it; one of which was a very large one and might be regarded as a kind of bay

‡ Demosthenes assigns 20,000 *contra* Aristag.

§ Lib. ii. Diodorus Siculus account perfectly agrees, lib. xii.

[Lib ii.], be great (to wit 18 miles, beside the sea-coast) yet Xenophon, [*De ratione red.*], says there was much waste ground within the walls. They seem indeed to have joined together four distinct and separate cities.

IV. No insurrection of the slaves, or suspicion of insurrection, is ever mentioned by historians, except one commotion of the miners [Athen. lib. vi.].

V. The treatment of slaves by the Athenians is said by Xenophon, [*De rep.* Athen.], and Demosthenes, [Philip. 3.], and Plautus, [Sticho], to have been extremely gentle and indulgent: which could never have been the case, had the disproportion been twenty to one. The disproportion is not so great in any of our colonies; yet are we obliged to exercise a rigorous and military government over the negroes.

VI. No man is ever esteemed rich for possessing what may be reckoned an equal distribution of property in any country, or even triple or quadruple that wealth. Thus every person in England is computed by some to spend sixpence a-day: yet is he esteemed but poor who has five times that sum. Now Timarchus is said by Æschines, [*Contra* Timarch.], to have been left in easy circumstances; but he was master only of ten slaves employed in manufactures. Lysias and his brother, two strangers, were proscribed by the thirty for their great riches, though they had but sixty a-piece. [*Orat.* 11.] Demosthenes was left very rich by his father, yet he had no more than 52 slaves. [*Contra* Aphob.] His work-house, of 20 cabinet-makers, is said to be a very considerable manufactory. [Ibid.]

VII. During the Decelian war, as the Greek historians call it, 20,000 slaves deserted, and brought the Athenians to great distress, as we learn from Thucydides. [Lib. vii.] This could not have happened, had they been only the twentieth part. The best slaves would not desert.

VIII. Xenophon [*De rat. red.*] proposes a scheme for maintaining by the public 10,000 slaves: and that so great a number may possibly be supported, any one will be convinced, says he, who considers the numbers we possessed before the Decelian war. A way of speaking altogether incompatible with the larger number of Athenæus.

IX. The whole *census* of the state of Athens was less than 6,000 talents. And though numbers in ancient MSS. be often suspected by critics, yet this is unexceptionable, both because Demosthenes, [*De classibus*], who gives it, gives also the detail, which checks him; and be-

* We are to observe, that when Dionysius Halicarnassæus says, that if we regard the ancient walls of Rome, the extent of that city will not appear greater than that of Athens, he must mean the Acropolis and high town only. No ancient author ever speaks of the Pyræum, Phalerus, and Munychia, as the same with Athens. Much less can it be supposed, that Dionysius would consider the matter in that light, after the walls of Cimon and Pericles were destroyed, and Athens was entirely separated from these other towns." This observation destroys all Vossius' reasonings, and introduces common sense into these calculations.

cause Polybius [Lib. ii cap 62], assigns the same number, and reasons upon it. Now, the most vulgar slave could yield by his labour an *obolus* a-day, over and above his maintenance, as we learn from Xenophon, [*De rat. red*] who says, that Nicias' overseer paid his master so much for slaves, whom he employed in mines If you will take the pains to estimate an *obolus* a-day, and the slaves at 400,000, computing only at four years purchase, you will find the sum above 12,000 talents, even though allowance be made for the great number of holidays in Athens Besides, many of the slaves would have a much greater value for their art. The lowest that Demosthenes estimates any of his [*Contra Aphobum*] father's slaves is two minas a-head And upon this supposition, it is a little difficult I confess, to reconcile even the number of 40,000 slaves with the *census* of 6,000 talents

X Chios is said by Thucydides [Lib viii] to contain more slaves than any Greek city except Sparta Sparta then had more than Athens, in proportion to the number of citizens The Spartans were 9,000 in the town, 30,000 in the country [Plutarch *in vita* Lycurg] The male slaves, therefore, of full age, must have been more than 780,000, the whole more than 3,120,000 A number impossible to be maintained in a narrow barren country, such as Laconia, which had no trade Had the Helotes been so very numerous, the murder of 2,000 mentioned by Thucydides [Lib iv] would have irritated them, without weakening them

Besides, we are to consider, that the number assigned by Athenæus,* whatever it is, comprehends all the inhabitants of Attica, as well as those of Athens The Athenians affected much a country life, as we learn from Thucydides [Lib ii], and when they were all chased into town, by the invasion of their territory during the Peloponnesian war, the city was not able to contain them, and they were obliged to lie in the porticoes, temples, and even streets, for want of lodging [Thucyd lib ii]

The same remark is to be extended to all the other Greek cities, and when the number of citizens is assigned, we must always understand it to comprehend the inhabitants of the neighbouring country, as well as of the city Yet even with this allowance, it must be confessed that Greece was a populous country, and exceeded what we could imagine concerning so narrow a territory, naturally not very fertile, and which drew no supplies of corn from other places For, excepting Athens, which traded to Pontus for that commodity, the other cities seem to have subsisted chiefly from their neighbouring territory†.

* The same author affirms, that Corinth had once 460 000 slaves Egina 470,000. But the foregoing arguments hold stronger against these facts, which are indeed entirely absurd and impossible. It is, however, remarkable, that Athenæus cites so great an authority as Aristotle for this last fact and the scholiast on Pindar mentions the same number of slaves in Egina.

† Demost. contra Lept The Athenians brought yearly from Pontus 400,000 medimni

Rhodes is well known to have been a city of extensive commerce, and of great fame and splendour, yet it contained only 6000 citizens able to bear arms, when it was besieged by Demetrius [Diodorus Sic lib xx]

Thebes was always one of the capital cities of Greec [Isocr *paneg*] But the number of its citizens exceeded not those of Rhodes * Phliasia is said to be a small city by Xenophon [Hist Græc lib vii], yet we find that it contained 6000 citizens [Id lib vii] I pretend not to reconcile these two facts Perhaps, Xenophon calls Phliasia a small town, because it made but a small figure in Greece, and maintained only a subordinate alliance with Sparta, or perhaps the country, belonging to it, was extensive, and most of the citizens were employed in the cultivation of it, and dwelt in the neighbouring villages

Mantinea was equal to any city in Arcadia. [Polyb lib ii] Consequently it was equal to Megalopolis, which was fifty stadia or six miles and a quarter in circumference [Polyb lib ix cap 20] But Mantinea had only 3000 citizens [Lysias, orat 34] The Greek cities, therefore, contained often fields and gardens, together with the houses, and we cannot judge of them by the extent of their walls Athens contained no more than 10,000 houses, yet its walls, with the sea-coast, were above 20 miles in extent Syracuse was 22 miles in circumference, yet was scarcely ever spoken of by the ancients as more populous than Athens Babylon was a square of 15 miles, or 60 miles in circuit, but it contained large cultivated fields and enclosures, as we learn from Pliny Though Aurelian's wall was 50 miles in circumference,† the circuit of all the 13 divisions of Rome, taken apart,

or bushels of corn, as appeared from the custom house books And this was the greater part of their importation of corn This by the bye is a strong proof that there is some great mistake in the foregoing passage of Athenæus For Attica itself was so barren of corn that it produced not enough even to maintain the peasants Tit Liv lib xliii cap 6 And 400 000 medimni would scarcely feed 100 000 men during a twelvemonth Lucian in his *navigium sive vota*, says, that a ship, which by the dimensions he gives seems to have been about the size of our third rates carried as much corn as would maintain all Attica for a twelvemonth But perhaps Athens was decayed at that time and, besides it is not safe to trust to such loose rhetorical calculations

* Diod Sic lib xvii When Alexander attacked Thebes we may safely conclude that almost all the inhabitants were present Whoever is acquainted with the spirit of the Greeks especially of the Thebans, will never suspect that any of them would desert their country when it was reduced to such extreme peril and distress As Alexander took the town by storm all those who bore arms were put to the sword without mercy and they amounted only to 6000 men Among these were some strangers and manumitted slaves. The captives, consisting of old men, women, children, and slaves, were sold, and they amounted to 30 000. We may therefore conclude that the free citizens in Thebes, of both sexes and all ages, were near 24,000 the strangers and slaves about 12,000. These last, we may observe, were somewhat fewer in proportion than at Athens as is reasonable to imagine from this circumstance, that Athens was a town of more trade to support slaves, and of more entertainment to allure strangers It is also to be remarked, that 36,000 was the whole number of people both in the city of Thebes and the neighbouring territory A very moderate number, it must be confessed and this computation, being founded on facts which appear indisputable, must have great weight in the present controversy The above mentioned number of Rhodians, too were all the inhabitants of the island, who were free, and able to bear arms

† Vopiscus *in vita Aurel.*

according to Publius Victor, was only about 43 miles. When an enemy invaded the country, all the inhabitants retired within the walls of the ancient cities, with their cattle and furniture, and instruments of husbandry; and the great height, to which the walls were raised, enabled a small number to defend them with facility.

Sparta, says Xenophon,* is one of the cities of Greece that has the fewest inhabitants. Yet Polybius [Polyb. lib. ix. cap. 20.] says, that it was 48 stadia in circumferance, and was round.

All the Ætolians able to bear arms in Antipater's time, deducting some few garrisons, were but 10,000 men. [Diod. Sic. xviii.]

Polybius [Legat.] tells us, that the Achæan league might, without any inconvenience, march 30 or 40,000 men; and this account seems propable; for that league comprehended the greater part of Peloponnesus. Yet Pausanias [*In* Achaicis] speaking of the same period, says, that all the Achæans able to bear arms, even when several manumitted slaves were joined to them, did not amount to 15,000.

The Thessalians, till their final conquest by the Romans, were, in all ages, turbulent, factious, seditious, disorderly.† It is not therefore natural to suppose, that this part of Greece abounded much in people.

We are told by Thucydides [Lib. vii.] that the part of Peloponnesus, adjoining to Pylos, was desert and uncultivated. Herodotus says [Lib. vii.] that Macedonia was full of lions and wild bulls; animals which can only inhabit vast unpeopled forests. These were the two extremities of Greece.

All the inhabitants of Epirus, of all ages, sexes, and conditions, who were sold by Paulus Æmilius, amounted only to 150,000. [Tit. Liv. lib. xlv. cap. 34.] Yet Epirus might be double the extent of Yorkshire.

Justin [Lib. ix. cap. 5.] tells us, that when Philip of Macedon was declared head of the Greek confederacy, he called a congress of all the states, except the Lacedemonians, who refused to concur; and he found the force of the whole, upon computation, to amount to 200,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry. This must be understood to be all the citizens capable of bearing arms. For as the Greek republics maintained no mercenary forces, and had no militia distinct from the whole body of citizens, it is not conceivable what other medium there could be of computation. That such an army could ever, by Greece, be brought into the field, and be maintained there, is contrary to all history. Upon this supposition, therefore, we may thus reason. The free Greeks of all ages and sexes were 860,000. The slaves, estimating them by the number of Athenian slaves as above, who seldom married or had families, were double the male citizens of full age, to wit, 430,000. And all the inhabitants of ancient Greece, excepting

* *De rep.* Laced. This passage is not easily reconciled with that of Plutarch above, who says that Sparta had 9000 citizens.

† Tit. Liv. lib. xxxiv. cap. 51. Plato *in* Critone.

Laconia, were 1,290,000. No mighty number, nor exceeding what may be found at present in Scotland, a country of not much greater extent, and very indifferently peopled.

We may now consider the numbers of people in Rome and Italy, and collect all the lights afforded us by scattered passages in ancient authors. We shall find, upon the whole, a great difficulty in fixing any opinion on that head, and no reason to support those exaggerated calculations, so much insisted on by modern writers.

Dionysius Hallicarnassæus [Lib. iv.] says, that the ancient walls of Rome were nearly of the same compass with those of Athens, but that the suburbs ran out to a great extent, and it was difficult to tell where the town ended or the country began. In some places of Rome, it appears, from the same author, [Lib. x.] from Juvenal, [Satyr. iii. l. 269, 270.], and from other ancient writers,* that the houses were high, and families lived in separate stories, one above another. But it is probable that these were only the poorer citizens, and only in some few streets. If we may judge from the younger Pliny's† account of his own house, and from Bartoli's plans of ancient buildings, the men of quality had very spacious palaces. and their buildings were like the Chinese houses at this day, where each apartment is separated from the rest, and rises no higher than a single story. To which if we add, that the Roman nobility much affected extensive porticos, and even woods‡ in town, we may perhaps allow Vossius, (though there is no manner of reason for it) to read the famous passage of the elder Pliny§ his own way. without admitting the extravagant consequences which he draws from it.

* STRABO, lib. v. says, that the Emperor Augustus prohibited the raising houses higher than 70 feet. In another passage lib. xvi. he speaks of the houses of Rome as remarkably high. See also to the same purpose Vitruvius, lib. ii. cap. 8. Aristides the sophist, in his oration εις Ρωμην says. that Rome consisted of cities on the top of cities. and that if one were to spread it out. and unfold it. it would cover the whole surface of Italy. Where an author indulges himself in such extravagant declamations, and gives so much into the hyperbolical style, one knows not how far he must be reduced. But this reasoning seems natural: if Rome was built in so scattered a manner as Dionysius says, and ran so much into the country, there must have been very few streets where the houses were raised so high. It is only for want of room that any body builds in that inconvenient manner.

† LIB. ii. epist. 16. lib. v. epist. 6. It is true, Pliny there describes a country house. But since that was the idea which the ancients formed of a magnificent and convenient building, the great men would certainly build the same way in town. 'In laxitatem ruris 'excurrunt,' says Seneca. of the rich and voluptuous. epist. 114. Valerius Maximus, lib. iv. cap. 4, speaking of Cincinnatus field of four acres, says, 'Auguste se habitare nunc putat, 'cujus domus tantum patet quantum Cincinnati rura patuerant. To the same purpose see lib. xxxvi. cap. 15, also lib. xviii. cap. 2.

‡ Vitruvius lib. iv. cap. 11. Tacitus annal. lib. xi. cap. 3. Sueton. *in vita* Octav. cap. 72, &c.

§ 'MOENIA ejus (Romæ) collegere ambitu imperatoribus, censoribusque Vespasianis, 'A. U. C. 828. pass. xiii. MCC. complexa montes septem, ipsa dividitur in regiones quatu'ordecim compita earum 265. Ejusdem spatii mensura, currente a milliario in capite Rom. 'Fori statuto, ad singulas portas, quæ sunt hodie numero 37, ita ut duodecim portæ semel 'numerentur, prætereanturque ex veteribus septem, quæ esse desierunt, efficit passuum per 'directum 30,775. Ad extrema vero tectorum cum castris prætoriis ab eodem Milliario, per 'vicos omnium viarum, mensura collegit paulo amplius septuaginta millia passuum. Quo si 'quis altitudinem tectorum addat dignam profecto, æstimationem concipiat, fateaturque 'nullius urbis magnitudinem in toto orbe potuisse ei comparari.' Plin. lib. iii. cap. 5.

All the best MSS. of Pliny read the passages as here cited, and fix the compass of the

The number of citizens who received corn by the public distribution in the time of Augustus were 200,000 [*Ex monument Ancyr*.] This one would esteem a pretty certain ground of calculation yet it is attended with such circumstances as throw us back into doubt and uncertainty

Did the poorer citizens only receive the distribution? It was calculated, to be sure, chiefly for their benefit But it appears from a passage in Cicero [*Tusc Quest* lib iii cap 48] that the rich might also take their portion, and that it was esteemed no reproach in them to apply for it.

walls of Rome to be 13 miles. The question is, What Pliny means by 30,775 paces, and how that number was formed? The manner in which I conceive it is this. Rome was a semicircular area of 13 miles circumference The Forum and consequently the Milliarium, we know, was situated on the banks of the Tyber and near the centre of the circle or upon the diameter of the semicircular area Though there were 37 gates to Rome yet only 12 of them had straight streets, leading from them to the Milliarium Pliny, therefore, having assigned the circumference of Rome and knowing that that alone was not sufficient to give us a just notion of its surface, uses this farther method He supposes all the streets, leading from the Milliarium to the 12 gates, to be laid together into one straight line, and supposes we run along that line so as to count each gate once in which case he says that the whole line is 30,775 paces or, in other words that each street or radius of the semicircular area is upon an average two miles and a half, and the whole length of Rome is 5 miles, and its breadth about half as much, besides the scattered suburbs

Pere Hardouin understands this passage in the same manner with regard to the laying together the several streets of Rome into one line, in order to compose 30 775 paces but then he supposes that streets led from the Milliarium to every gate and that no street exceeded 800 paces in length But I A semicircular area, whose radius was only 800 paces could never have a circumference near 13 miles the compass of Rome as assigned by Pliny A radius of two miles and a half forms very nearly that circumference II There is an absurdity in supposing a city so built as to have streets running to its centre from every gate in its circumference these streets must interfere as they approach III This diminishes too much from the greatness of ancient Rome and reduces that city below even Bristol or Rotterdam

The sense which Vossius, in his *Observationes variae* puts on this passage of Pliny errs widely in the other extreme One MSS of no authority instead of 13 miles, has assigned 30 miles for the compass of the walls of Rome And Vossius understands this only of the curvilinear part of the circumference supposing that as the Tyber formed the diameter there were no walls built on that side But, I This reading is allowed to be contrary to almost all the MSS II Why should Pliny a concise writer, repeat the compass of the walls of Rome in two successive sentences? III Why repeat it with so sensible a variation? IV What is the meaning of Pliny's mentioning twice the Milliarium, if a line was measured that had no dependence on the Milliarium? V Aurelian's wall is said by Vopiscus to have been drawn *laxiore ambitu* and to have comprehended all the buildings and suburbs on the north side of the Tyber yet its compass was only 50 miles and even here critics suspect some mistake or corruption in the text since the walls which remain and which are supposed to be the same with Aurelian's, exceeds not 12 miles It is not probable that Rome would diminish from Augustus to Aurelian. It remained still the capital of the same empire and none of the civil wars in that long period except the tumults on the death of Maximus and Balbinus, ever affected the city Caracalla is said by Aurelius Victor to have increased Rome VI There are no remains of ancient buildings which mark any such greatness of Rome Vossius reply to this objection seems absurd that the rubbish would sink 60 or 70 feet under ground It appears from Spartian (*in vita Severi*) that the five mile stone *in via Lavicana* was out of the city VII Olympiodorus and Publius Victor fix the number of houses in Rome to be between 40,000 and 50,000 VIII The very extravagances of the consequences drawn by this critic, as well as Lipsius, if they be necessary, destroys the foundation on which they are grounded that Rome contained 14,000,000 of inhabitants while the whole kingdom of France contains only five according to his computation, &c.

The only objection to the sense which we have affixed above to the passage of Pliny, seems to lie in this, that Pliny after mentioning the 37 gates of Rome, assigns only a reason for suppressing the 7 old ones, and says nothing of the 18 gates the streets leading from which terminated, according to my opinion, before they reached the Forum. But as Pliny was writing to the Romans, who perfectly knew the disposition of the streets, it is not strange he should take a circumstance for granted, which was so familiar to every body Perhaps, too, many of these gates led to wharfs upon the river

To whom was the corn given, whether only to heads of families, or to every man, woman, and child? The portion every month was five *modii* to each* (about five-sixths of a bushel.) This was too little for a family, and too much for an individual. A very accurate antiquary, therefore, infers, that it was given to every man of full age: but he allows the matter to be uncertain.

Was it strictly enquired, whether the claimant lived within the precincts of Rome? or was it sufficient, that he presented himself at the monthly distribution? This last seems more probable.†

Were there no false claimants? We are told [*Sueton in Jul* cap 4], that Cæsar struck off at once 170,000, who had creeped in without a just title; and it is very little probable that he remedied all such abuses.

But lastly, what proportion of slaves must we assign to these citizens? This is the most material question, and the most uncertain. It is very doubtful, whether Athens can be established as a rule for Rome. Perhaps the Athenians had more slaves, because they employed them in manufactures, for which a capital city, like Rome, seems not so proper. Perhaps, on the other hand, the Romans had more slaves, on account of their superior luxury and riches.

There were exact bills of mortality kept at Rome; but no ancient author has given us the number of burials, except Suetonius, [*In Vita Neronis*], who tells us, that in one season there were 30,000 names carried to the temple of Libetina: but this was during a plague, which can afford no certain foundation for any inference.

The public corn, though distributed only to 200,000 citizens, affected very considerably the whole agriculture of Italy [*Sueton Aug* cap 42.] A fact no wise reconcileable to some modern exaggerations with regard to the inhabitants of that country.‡

The best ground of conjecture I can find concerning the greatness of ancient Rome is this: we are told by Herodian, [Lib iv cap 5.] that Antioch and Alexandria, were very little inferior to Rome. It appears from Diodorus Siculus [Lib xvii] that one straight street of Alexandria, reaching from gate to gate, was five miles long; and as Alexandria was much more extended in length than breadth, it seems to have been a city nearly of the bulk of Paris,§ and Rome might be about the size of London.

* *Licinius apud Sallust hist frag* lib iii

† *Nicolaus Hortensius de re frumentaria Roman*

‡ Not to take the people too much from their business, Augustus ordained the distribution of corn to be made only thrice a year: but the people, finding the monthly distributions more convenient (as preserving, I suppose, a more regular economy in their family), desired to have them restored. Sueton August cap 40. Had not some of the people come from some distance for their corn, Augustus' precaution seems superfluous.

§ Quintus Curtius says its walls were 10 miles in circumference, when founded by Alexander lib iv cap 8. Strabo, who travelled to Alexandria, as well as Diodorus Siculus, says it was scarce 4 miles long, and in most places about a mile broad; lib. xvii. Pliny said it resembled a Macedonian cassock, stretching out in the corners; lib. v. cap. 10. [illegible]

There lived in Alexandria, in Diodorus Siculus's time, [Lib xvii.] 300,000 free people, comprehending, I suppose, women and children* But what number of slaves? Had we any just ground to fix these at an equal number with the free inhabitants, it would favour the foregoing computation.

There is a passage in Herodian which is a little surprising He says positively, that the palace of the Emperor was as large as all the rest of the city † This was Nero's golden house, which is indeed represented by Suetonius‡ and Pliny as of an enormous extent, § but no power of imagination can make us conceive it to bear any proportion to such a city as London

We may observe, had the historian been relating Nero's extravagance, and had he made use of such an expression, it would have had much less weight, these rhetorical exaggerations being so apt to creep into an author's style, even when the most chaste and correct. But it is mentioned by Herodian only, by the bye, in relating the quarrels between Geta and Caracalla

It appears from the same historian, [Lib ii cap 15] that there was then much land uncultivated, and put to no manner of use, and he ascribes it as a great praise to Pertinax, that he allowed every one to take such land, either in Italy or elsewhere, and cultivate it as he pleased, without paying any taxes *Lands uncultivated, and put to no manner of use!* This is not heard of in any part of Christendom,

withstanding this bulk of Alexandria which seems but moderate, Diodorus Siculus, speaking of its circuit as drawn by Alexander (which it never exceeded as we learn from Ammianus Marcellinus lib xxii cap 16) says it was μεγεθει διαφεροντα *extremely great*, ibid The reason which he assigns for its surpassing all cities in the world (for he excepts not Rome) is, that it contained 300 000 free inhabitants. He also mentions the revenues of the kings to wit 6000 talents as another circumstance to the same purpose No such mighty sum in our eyes, even though we make allowance for the different value of money What Strabo says of the neighbouring country, means only that it was well peopled, οικουμενα καλως Might not one affirm without any great hyperbole, that the whole banks of the river from Gravesend to Windsor are one city? This is even more than Strabo says of the banks of the lake Mæretis and of the canal to Canopus. It is a vulgar saying in Italy that the King of Sardinia has but one town in Piedmont for it is all a town Agrippa, *in Josephus de bello Judaico lib ii cap* 16, to make his audience comprehend the excessive greatness of Alexandria which he endeavours to magnify describes only the compass of the city as drawn by Alexander A clear proof that the bulk of the inhabitants were lodged there and that the neighbouring country was no more than what might be expected about all great towns very well cultivated and well peopled.

* He says ελευθεροι, not πολιται which last expression must have been understood of citizens alone, and grown men

† Lib. iv cap. 1 πασης πολεως Politian interprets it, 'ædibus majoribus etiam reliqua urbe'

‡ He says (in Nerone cap 30) that a portico or piazza of it was 3000 feet long, 'tanta 'laxitas ut porticus triplices milliarias haberet. He cannot mean 3 miles. For the whole extent of the house from the Palatine to the Esquiline was not near so great. So when Vopisc. in Aureliano mentions a portico in Sallust's gardens, which he calls *porticus milliarensis*, it must be understood of a thousand feet. So also Horace

'Nulla decempedis
Metata privatis opacam
Porticus excipiebat Arcton.'—*Lib.* ii. Ode 15.

So also in lib. i. satyr 8

'Mille pedes in fronte, trecentos cippus in agrum
'Hic dabat'.

§ Plinius, lib xxxvi. cap. 15. 'Bis vidimus urbem totam cingi domibus principum, Caii ac Neronis.'

except in some remote parts of Hungary, as I have been informed. And surely it corresponds very ill with that idea of the extreme populousness of antiquity so much insisted on.

We learn from Vopiscus, [In Aurelian cap. 48.] that there was even in Etruria much fertile land uncultivated, which the emperor Aurelian intended to convert into vineyards, in order to furnish the Roman people with a gratuitous distribution of wine; a very proper expedient for depopulating still farther that capital, and all the neighbouring territories.

It may not be amiss to take notice of the account which Polybius [Lib. xxi cap. 2.] gives of the great herds of swine to be met with in Tuscany and Lombardy, as well as in Greece, and of the method of feeding them which was then practised. 'There are great herds of 'swine,' says he, 'throughout all Italy, particularly in former times, 'through Etruria and Cisalpine Gaul. And a herd frequently consists 'of 1,000 or more swine. When one of these herds in feeding meets 'with another, they mix together; and the swine-herds have no other 'expedient for separating them than to go to different quarters, where 'they sound their horn; and these animals, being accustomed to that 'signal, run immediately each to the horn of his own keeper. Whereas 'in Greece, if the herds of swine happen to mix in the forests, he who 'has the greater flock takes cunningly the opportunity of driving all 'away. And thieves are very apt to purloin the straggling hogs, 'which have wandered to a great distance from their keeper in search 'of their food.'

May we not infer, from this account, that the north of Italy, as well as Greece, was then much less peopled, and worse cultivated, than at present? How could these vast herds be fed in a country so full of inclosures, so improved by agriculture, so divided by farms, so planted with vines and corn intermingled together? I must confess, that Polybius' relation has more the air of that economy which is to be met with in our American colonies, than the management of an European country.

We meet with a reflection in Aristotle's* Ethics which seems unaccountable to any supposition, and by proving too much in favour of our present reasoning, may be thought really to prove nothing. That philosopher, treating of friendship, and observing, that this relation ought neither to be contracted to a very few, nor extending over a great multitude, illustrates his opinion by the following argument. 'In like manner,' says he, 'as a city cannot subsist, 'if it either have so few inhabitants as ten, or so many as a 100,000; 'so is there a mediocrity required in the number of friends; and you 'destroy the essence of friendship by running into either extreme.' What! impossible that a city can contain a 100,000 inhabitants! Had

* Lib. ix. cap. 10. His expression is ἄνθρωπος, not πολίτης; inhabitant, not citizen.

Aristotle never seen nor heard of a city so populous? This, I must own, passes my comprehension.

Pliny [Lib vi 28] tells us, that Seleucia, the seat of the Greek Empire in the East, was reported to contain 600,000 people. Carthage is said by Strabo [Lib xvii] to have contained 700,000. The inhabitants of Pekin are not much more numerous London, Paris, and Constantinople, may admit of nearly the same computation, at least, the two latter cities do not exceed it Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, we have already spoken of From the experience of past and present ages, one might conjecture that there is a kind of impossibility that any city could ever rise much beyond the proportion Whether the grandeur of a city be founded on commerce or on empire, there seem to be invincible obstacles which prevent its farther progress The seats of vast monarchies, by introducing extravagant luxury, irregular expenses, idleness, dependence, and false ideas of rank and superiority, are improper for commerce Extensive commerce checks itself, by raising the price of all labour and commodities When a great court engages the attendance of a numerous nobility, possessed of overgrown fortunes, the middling gentry remain in their provincial towns, where they can make a figure on a moderate income And if the dominions of a state arrive at an enormous size, there necessarily arise many capitals, in the remoter provinces, whither all the inhabitants, except a few courtiers, repair for education fortune, and amusement* London, by uniting extensive commerce and middling empire, has perhaps arrived at a greatness, which no city will ever be able to exceed

Choose Dover or Calais for a centre draw a circle of two hundred miles radius you comprehend London, Paris, the Netherlands, the united provinces and some of the best cultivated parts of France and England. It may safely, I think, be affirmed that no spot of ground can be found, in antiquity, of equal extent, which contained near so many great and populous cities, and was so stocked with riches and inhabitants

To balance, in both periods, the states which possessed most art knowledge, civility, and the best police, seems the truest method of comparison

It is an observation of L'abbe du Bos, that Italy is warmer at present that it was in ancient times 'The annals of Rome tell us,' says he, 'that in the year 480 *ab U C* the winter was so severe that it destroyed the trees The Tyber froze in Rome, and the ground was covered with snow for forty days. When Juvenal [Sat. 6.] describes a superstitious woman, he represents her as breaking the ice of the Tyber, that she might perform her ablutions

* Such were Alexandria, Antioch, Carthage, Ephesus, Lyons, &c. in the Roman empire. Such are even Bourdeaux, Tholouse, Dijon, Rennes, Rouen, Aix, &c. in France, Dublin, Edinburgh, York, in the British dominions.

'*Hybernum fracta glacie descendet in amnem,*
'*Ter Matutino Tyberi mergetur*

'He speaks of that river's freezing as a common event Many pas-'sages of Horace suppose the streets of Rome full of snow and ice. 'We should have more certainty with regard to this point, had the 'ancients known the use of thermometers but their writers, withou 'intending it, give us information, sufficient to convince us, that the 'winters are now much more temperate at Rome than formerly A 'present the Tyber no more freezes at Rome than the Nile at Cairo. 'The Romans esteem the winters very rigorous, if the snow lie two 'days, and if one see for 48 hours a few icicles hang from a fountain 'that has a north exposure'

The observation of this ingenious critic may be extended to other European climates Who could discover the mild climate of France in Diodorus Siculus [Lib iv] description of that of Gaul? 'As it is 'a northern climate,' says he, 'it is infested with cold to an extreme degree In cloudy weather, instead of rain, there fall great snows, 'and in clear weather it there freezes so excessive hard, that the rivers 'acquire bridges of their own substance, over which, not only single 'travellers may pass, but large armies, accompanied with all their 'baggage and loaded waggons And there being many rivers in Gaul, 'the Rhone, the Rhine, &c almost all of them are frozen over, and it is usual, in order to prevent falling, to cover the ice with chaff and 'straw at the places where the road passes' *Colder than a Gallic Winter*, is used by Petronius as a proverbial expression Aristotle says, that Gaul is so cold a climate that an ass could not live in it [De generat anim lib ii]

North of the Cevennes, says Strabo [Lib iv], Gaul produces not figs and olives and the vines, which have been planted, bear not grapes that will ripen

Ovid positively maintains, with all the serious affirmation of prose, that the Euxine Sea was frozen over every winter in his time, and he appeals to Roman governors, whom he names, for the truth of his assertion.* This seldom or never happens at present in the latitude of Tomi, whether Ovid was banished All the complaints of the same poet seem to mark rigour of the seasons, which is scarcely experienced at present in Petersburgh or Stockholm

Tournefort, a *Provencal*, who had travelled into the same country, observes, that there is not a finer climate in the world and he asserts, that nothing but Ovid's melancholy could have given him such dismal ideas of it. But the facts, mentioned by that poet, are too circumstantial to bear any such interpretation.

Polybius [Lib iv cap 21] says, that the climate in Arcadia was very cold, and the air moist.

* *Trist.* lib. iii. eleg. 9. *De Ponto*, lib. iv eleg. 7, 9, 10.

'Italy,' says Varro [Lib. i. cap. 2], 'is the most temperate climate in Europe. The inland parts, (Gaul, Germany, and Pannonia, no doubt) have almost perpetual winter.'

The northern parts of Spain, according to Strabo [Lib. iii.], are but ill inhabited, because of the great cold.

Allowing, therefore, this remark to be just, that Europe is become warmer than formerly, how can we account for it? Plainly, by no other method, that by supposing, that the land is at present much better cultivated, and that the woods are cleared, which formerly threw a shade upon the earth, and kept the rays of the sun from penetrating to it. Our northern colonies in America become more temperate, in proportion as the woods are felled,* but in general, every one may remark, that cold is still much more severely felt, both in North and South America, than in places under the same latitude in Europe.

Saserna, quoted by Columella [Lib. i. cap. i.], affirmed, that the disposition of the heavens was altered before his time, and that the air had become much milder and warmer, as appears hence, says he, that many places now abound with vineyards and olive plantations, which formerly, by reason of the rigour of the climate, could raise none of these productions. Such a change, if real, will be allowed an evident sign of the better cultivation and peopling of countries before the age of Saserna;† and if it be continued to the present times is a proof, that these advantages have been continually increasing throughout this part of the world.

Let us now cast our eye over all the countries which are the scene of ancient and modern history, and compare their past and present situation: we shall not, perhaps, find such foundation for the complaint of the present emptiness and desolation of the world. Egypt is represented by Maillet, to whom we owe the best account of it, as extremely populous, though he esteems the number of its inhabitants to be diminished. Syria, and the Lesser Asia, as well as the coasts of Barbary, I can readily own to be desert in comparison of their ancient condition. The depopulation of Greece is also obvious. But whether the country now called Turkey in Europe may not, in general, contain more inhabitants than during the flourishing period of Greece, may be a little doubtful. The Thracians seem then to have lived like the Tartars at present, by pasturage and plunder;‡ the Getes were still more uncivilized;§ and the Illyrians were no better.‖ these occupy nine-tenths of that country: and though the government of the Turks be not very favourable to industry and propagation; yet it preserves

* The warm southern colonies also become more heathful: and it is remarkable, that in the Spanish histories of the first discovery and conquest of these countries they appear to have been very healthful, being then well peopled and cultivated. No account of the sickness or decay of Cortes' or Pizarro's small armies.

† He seems to have lived about the time of the younger Africanus, lib. i. cap. 2.

‡ Xenoph. Exp. lib. viii. Polyb. lib. iv. cap. 45.

§ Ovid. passim, &c. Strabo, lib. vii.

‖ Polyb, lib. ii. cap. 12.

at least peace and order among the inhabitants, and is preferable to that barbarous, unsettled condition, in which they anciently lived.

Poland and Muscovy in Europe are not populous, but are certainly much more so than the ancient Sarmatia and Scythia, where no husbandry or tillage was ever heard of, and pasturage was the sole art by which the people were maintained. The like observation may be extended to Denmark and Sweden. No one ought to esteem the immense swarms of people which formerly came from the North, and over-ran all Europe, to be any objection to this opinion. Where a whole nation, or even half of it, remove their seat, it is easy to imagine what a prodigious multitude they must form, with what desperate valour they must make their attacks, and how the terror they strike into the invaded nations will make these magnify, in their imagination, both the courage and multitude of the invaders. Scotland is neither extensive nor populous, but were the half of its inhabitants to seek new seats, they would form a colony as numerous as the Teutons and Cimbri, and would shake all Europe, supposing it in no better condition for defence than formerly.

Germany has surely at present twenty times more inhabitants than in ancient times, when they cultivated no ground, and each tribe valued itself on the extensive desolation which it spread around, as we learn from Cæsar,* and Tacitus,† and Strabo. [Lib. vii.] A proof, that the division into small republics will not alone render a nation populous, unless attended with the spirit of peace, order, and industry.

The barbarous condition of Britain in former times is well known, and the thinness of its inhabitants may easily be conjectured, both from their barbarity, and from a circumstance mentioned by Herodian, [Lib. iii., cap. 47.] that all Britain was marshy even in Severus's time, after the Romans had been fully settled in it above a century.

It is not easily imagined, that the Gauls were anciently much more advanced in the arts of life than their northern neighbours, since they travelled to this island for their education in the mysteries of the religion and philosophy of the Druids.‡ I cannot, therefore, think that Gaul was then near so populous as France is at present.

Were we to believe, indeed, and join together, the testimony of Appian, and that of Diodorus Siculus, we must admit of an incredible populousness in Gaul. The former historian § says, that there were 400 nations in the country, the latter [Lib. v.] affirms, that the largest of the Gallic nations consisted of 200,000 men, besides women and children, and the least of 50,000. Calculating, therefore, at a medium, we must admit of near 200,000,000 of people in a country which we esteem

* *De Bello Gallico*, lib. vi. † *De Moribus Germ.*

‡ Cæsar *de Bello Gallico*, lib. xvi. Strabo, lib. vii. says, the Gauls were not much more improved than the Germans.

§ Celt. pars. 1.

populous at present, though supposed to contain little more than twenty.* Such calculations, therefore, by their extravagance, loose all manner of authority. We may observe, that the equality of property to which the populousness of antiquity may be ascribed, had no place among the Gauls. [*Id. ibid.*] Their intestine wars also, before Cæsar's time, were almost perpetual. [Lib. iv.] And Strabo† observes, that though all Gaul was cultivated, yet was it not cultivated with any skill or care; the genius of the inhabitants leading them less to arts than arms; till their slavery under Rome produced peace among themselves.

Cæsar‡ enumerates very particularly the great forces which were levied in Belgium to oppose his conquests; and makes them amount to 208,000. These were not the whole people able to bear arms: for the same historian tells us, that the Bellovaci could have brought 100,000 men into the field, though they engaged only for sixty. Taking the whole, therefore, in this proportion of ten to six, the sum of fighting men in all the states of Belgium was about 350,000; all the inhabitants 1,500,000. And Belgium being about a fourth of Gaul, that country might contain 6,000,000, which is not near the third of its present inhabitants.§ We are informed by Cæsar, that the Gauls had no fixed property in land; but that the chieftains, when any death happened in a family, made a new division of all the lands among the several members of the family. This is the custom of *Tanistry*, which so long prevailed in Ireland, and which retained that country in a state of misery, barbarism, and desolation.

The ancient Helvetia was 250 miles in length, and 180 in breadth, according to the same author [*De Bello Gallico*, lib. i.], yet contained only 360,000 inhabitants. The canton of Berne alone has, at present, as many people.

After this computation of Appian and Diodorus Siculus, I know not, whether I dare affirm that the modern Dutch are more numerous than the ancient Batavi.

Spain is, perhaps, decayed from what it was three centuries ago; but if we step backward two thousand years and consider the restless, turbulent, unsettled condition of its inhabitants, we may probably be inclined to think that it is now much more populous. Many Spaniards

* Ancient Gaul was more extensive than modern France.

† Cæsar *de Bello Gallico*, lib. vi.

‡ *De Bello Gallico*, lib. ii.

§ It appears from Cæsar's account, that the Gauls had no domestic slaves, who formed a different order from the *Plebes*. The whole common people were indeed a kind of slaves to the nobility, as the people of Poland are at this day: and a nobleman of Gaul had sometimes 10,000 dependents of this kind. Nor can we doubt that the armies were composed of the people as well as of the nobility. An army of 100,000 noblemen, from a very small state, is incredible. The fighting men among the *Helvetii* were the fourth part of the inhabitants; a clear proof that all the males of military age bore arms.—*Cæs. de bello Gall.* lib. i.

We may remark, that the numbers in Cæsar's commentaries can be more depended on than those of any other ancient author, because of the Greek translation, which still remains, and which checks the Latin original.

at least peace and order among the inhabitants, and is preferable to that barbarous, unsettled condition, in which they anciently lived.

Poland and Muscovy in Europe are not populous, but are certainly much more so than the ancient Sarmatia and Scythia, where no husbandry or tillage was ever heard of, and pasturage was the sole art by which the people were maintained. The like observation may be extended to Denmark and Sweden. No one ought to esteem the immense swarms of people which formerly came from the North, and over-ran all Europe, to be any objection to this opinion. Where a whole nation, or even half of it, remove their seat, it is easy to imagine what a prodigious multitude they must form, with what desperate valour they must make their attacks, and how the terror they strike into the invaded nations will make these magnify, in their imagination, both the courage and multitude of the invaders. Scotland is neither extensive nor populous, but were the half of its inhabitants to seek new seats, they would form a colony as numerous as the Teutons and Cimbri, and would shake all Europe, supposing it in no better condition for defence than formerly.

Germany has surely at present twenty times more inhabitants than in ancient times, when they cultivated no ground, and each tribe valued itself on the extensive desolation which it spread around, as we learn from Cæsar,* and Tacitus,† and Strabo. [Lib. vii.] A proof, that the division into small republics will not alone render a nation populous, unless attended with the spirit of peace, order, and industry.

The barbarous condition of Britain in former times is well known, and the thinness of its inhabitants may easily be conjectured, both from their barbarity and from a circumstance mentioned by Herodian, [Lib. iii, cap. 47.] that all Britain was marshy, even in Severus's time, after the Romans had been fully settled in it above a century.

It is not easily imagined, that the Gauls were anciently much more advanced in the arts of life than their northern neighbours, since they travelled to this island for their education in the mysteries of the religion and philosophy of the Druids.‡ I cannot, therefore, think that Gaul was then near so populous as France is at present.

Were we to believe, indeed, and join together, the testimony of Appian, and that of Diodorus Siculus, we must admit of an incredible populousness in Gaul. The former historian § says, that there were 400 nations in the country, the latter [Lib. v.] affirms, that the largest of the Gallic nations consisted of 200,000 men, besides women and children, and the least of 50,000. Calculating, therefore, at a medium, we must admit of near 200,000,000 of people in a country which we esteem

* *De Bello Gallico*, lib. vi. † *De Moribus Germ.*

‡ Cæsar *de Bello Gallico*, lib. xvi. Strabo, lib. vii. says, the Gauls were not much more improved than the Germans.

§ Celt. para. 1.

populous at present, though supposed to contain little more than twenty.* Such calculations, therefore, by their extravagance, loose all manner of authority. We may observe, that the equality of property to which the populousness of antiquity may be ascribed, had no place among the Gauls [*Id. ibid.*] Their intestine wars also, before Cæsar's time, were almost perpetual. [Lib. iv.] And Strabo† observes, that though all Gaul was cultivated, yet was it not cultivated with any skill or care, the genius of the inhabitants leading them less to arts than arms till their slavery under Rome produced peace among themselves.

Cæsar‡ enumerates very particularly the great forces which were levied in Belgium to oppose his conquests, and makes them amount to 208,000. These were not the whole people able to bear arms: for the same historian tells us, that the Bellovaci could have brought 100,000 men into the field, though they engaged only for sixty. Taking the whole, therefore, in this proportion of ten to six, the sum of fighting men in all the states of Belgium was about 350,000, all the inhabitants 1,500,000. And Belgium being about a fourth of Gaul, that country might contain 6,000,000, which is not near the third of its present inhabitants.§ We are informed by Cæsar, that the Gauls had no fixed property in land, but that the chieftains, when any death happened in a family, made a new division of all the lands among the several members of the family. This is the custom of *Tanistry*, which so long prevailed in Ireland, and which retained that country in a state of misery, barbarism, and desolation.

The ancient Helvetia was 250 miles in length, and 180 in breadth, according to the same author [*De Bello Gallico*, lib. i.], yet contained only 360,000 inhabitants. The canton of Berne alone has, at present, as many people.

After this computation of Appian and Diodorus Siculus, I know not, whether I dare affirm that the modern Dutch are more numerous than the ancient Batavi.

Spain is, perhaps, decayed from what it was three centuries ago; but if we step backward two thousand years and consider the restless, turbulent, unsettled condition of its inhabitants, we may probably be inclined to think that it is now much more populous. Many Spaniards

* Ancient Gaul was more extensive than modern France.

† Cæsar *de Bello Gallico*, lib. vi.

‡ *De Bello Gallico*, lib. ii.

§ It appears from Cæsar's account, that the Gauls had no domestic slaves, who formed a different order from the *Plebes*. The whole common people were indeed a kind of slaves to the nobility, as the people of Poland are at this day: and a nobleman of Gaul had sometimes 10,000 dependents of this kind. Nor can we doubt that the armies were composed of the people as well as of the nobility. An army of 100,000 noblemen, from a very small state, is incredible. The fighting men among the Helvetii were the fourth part of the inhabitants; a clear proof that all the males of military age bore arms.—*Cæs. de bello Gall.* lib. i.

We may remark, that the numbers in Cæsar's commentaries can be more depended on than those of any other ancient author, because of the Greek translation, which still remains, and which checks the Latin original.

killed themselves when deprived of their arms by the Romans. [Tit. Livii, lib xxxiv. cap 17] It appears from Plutarch, [*In vita Marii*] that robbery and plunder were esteemed honourable among the Spaniards Hirtius [*De Bello Hisp*] represents in the same light the situation of that country in Cæsar's time, and he says, that every man was obliged to live in castles and walled towns for his security It was not till its final conquest under Augustus, that these disorders were repressed. [*Vell Paterc* lib ii sect 90] The account which Strabo [Lib iii] and Justin [Lib xliv] give of Spain, corresponds exactly with those above mentioned How much, therefore, must it diminish from our idea of the populousness of antiquity, when we find that Tully, comparing Italy, Afric, Gaul, Greece, and Spain, mentions the great number of inhabitants as the peculiar circumstance which rendered this latter country formidable?*

Italy, however, it is probable, has decayed but how many great cities does it still contain? Venice, Genoa, Pavia, Turin, Milan, Naples, Florence, Leghorn, which either subsisted not in ancient times, or were then very inconsiderable? If we reflect on this, we shall not be apt to carry matters to so great an extreme as is usual with regard to this subject

When the Roman authors complain, that Italy, which formerly exported corn, became dependent on all the provinces for its daily bread, they never ascribe this alteration to the increase of its inhabitants, but to the neglect of tillage and agriculture† A natural effect of that pernicious practice of importing corn, in order to distribute it *gratis* among the Roman citizens, and a very bad means of multiplying the inhabitants of any country‡ The *sportula*, so much talked of by Martial and Juvenal, being presents regularly made by the great lords to their smaller clients, must have had a like tendency to produce idleness, debauchery, and a continual decay among the people The parish rates have at present the same bad consequences in England

Were I to assign a period when I imagine this part of the world might possibly contain more inhabitants than at present, I should pitch upon the age of Trajan and the Antonines, the great extent of the Roman empire being then civilized and cultivated, settled almost in a profound peace, both foreign and domestic, and living under the same regular police and government § But we are told, that all extensive

* 'Nec numero Hispanos, nec robore Gallos nec calliditate Pœnos, nec artibus Græcas 'nec denique hoc ipsos hujus gentis, ac terræ domestico nativoque sensu, Italos ipsos hujus 'gentis, ac terræ domestico nativoque sensu, Italos ipsos ac Latinos—superavimus. *De harusp resp* cap 9. The disorders of Spain seem to have been almost proverbial 'Nec impacatos a tergo horrebis Iberos *Virg Georg* lib. iii. The Iberi are here plainly taken, by a poetical figure, for robbers in general

† Varro *de re rustica*, lib ii præf Columella præf Sueton August cap. 42

‡ Through the observations of L'Abbe du Bos should be admitted, that Italy is now warmer than in former times, the consequence may not be necessary, that it is more populous or better cultivated. If the other countries of Europe were more savage and woody, the cold winds that blew from them might affect the climate of Italy.

§ The inhabitants of Marseilles lost not their superiority over the Gauls in commerce and

governments, especially absolute monarchies, are pernicious to population, and contain a secret vice and poison, which destroy the effect of all these promising appearances [*L'Esprit de Loix*, liv xxiii. chap 19.] To confirm this, there is a passage cited from Plutarch [*De Orac Defectus*] which being somewhat singular, we shall here examine it

That author, endeavouring to account for the silence of many of the oracles, says, that it may be ascribed to the present desolation of the world, proceeding from former wars and factions, which common calamity, he adds, has fallen heavier upon Greece than any other country, insomuch that the whole could scarcely at present furnish 3,000 warriors, a number which, in the time of the Median war, were supplied by the single city of Megara The gods, therefore, who affect works of dignity and importance, have suppressed many of their oracles, and deign not to use so many interpreters of their will to so diminutive a people

the mechanic arts, till the Roman dominion turned the latter from arms to agriculture and civil life Strabo lib iv That author, in several places repeats the observation concerning the improvement arising from the Roman arts and civility and he lived at the time when the change was new and would be more sensible So also Pliny 'Quis enim non communicato orbe terrarum majestate Romani imperii profecisse vitam putet, commercio rerum ac societate festæ pacis omniaque etiam, quæ occulta antea fuerant in promiscuo 'usu facta Lib xiv proem Numine deum electa (speaking of Italy) quæ cœlum ipsum 'clarius faceret, sparsa congregaret imperia ritusque molliret et tot populorum discordes, ferasque linguas sermonis commercio contraheret ad colloquia et humanitatem homini 'daret breviterque, una cunctarum gentium in toto orbe patria fieret lib ii cap 5. Nothing can be stronger to this purpose than the following passage from Tertullian, who lived about the age of Severus Certe quidem ipse orbis in promtu est, cultior de die et 'instructior pristino Omnia jam pervia omnia nota omnia negotiosa. Solitudines 'famosas retro fundi amœnissimi obliteraverunt silvas arva domuerunt feras pecora fugaverunt arenæ seruntur saxa panguntur paludes eliquantur tantæ urbes, quantæ non 'casæ quondam Jam nec insulæ horrent, nec scopuli terrent ubique domus ubique 'populus ubique respublica ubique vita Summum testimonium frequentiæ humanæ, 'onerosi sumus mundo vix nobis elementa sufficiunt et necessitates arctiores, et querelæ 'apud omnes, dum jam nos natura non sustinet De anima cap 30 The air of rhetoric and declamation which appears in this passage diminishes somewhat from its authority but does not entirely destroy it The same remark may be extended to the following passage of Aristides the sophist who lived in the age of Adrian The whole world says he, addressing himself to the Romans 'seems to keep one holiday and mankind laying aside 'the sword which they formerly wore, now betake themselves to feasting and to joy The 'cities forgetting their ancient animosities preserve only one emulation which shall embellish itself most by every art and ornament theatres every where arise amphitheatres, 'porticos aqueducts temples schools, academies and one may safely pronounce, that the 'sinking world has been again raised by your auspicious empire Nor have cities alone received an increase of ornament and beauty but the whole earth, like a garden of paradise, is cultivated and adorned insomuch that such of mankind as are placed out of the 'limits of your empire (who are but few) seem to merit our sympathy and compassion.

It is remarkable, that though Diodorus Siculus makes the inhabitants of Egypt, when conquered by the Romans, amount only to 3,000,000 yet *Joseph. de bello Jud lib ii. cap.* 16, says, that its inhabitants, excluding those of Alexandria were 7,500,000, in the reign of Nero and he expressly says that he drew this account from the books of the Roman Publicans who levied the poll-tax Strabo, lib xvii. praises the superior police of the Romans with regard to the finances of Egypt, above that of its former monarchs and no part of administration is more essential to the happiness of a people. Yet we read in Athenæus (lib i. cap 25), who flourished during the reign of the Antonines, that the town Marea, near Alexandria, which was formerly a large city, had dwindled into a village. This is not, properly speaking, a contradiction Suidas (August) says, that the Emperor Augustus, having numbered the whole Roman empire, found it contained only 4,101,017 men (ἄνδρες). There is here surely some great mistake, either in the author or transcriber. But this authority, feeble as it is, may be sufficient to counterbalance the exaggerated accounts of Herodotus, and Diodorus Siculus, with regard to more early times.

I must confess that this passage contains so many difficulties that I know not what to make of it. You may observe, that Plutarch assigns, for a cause of the decay of mankind, not the extensive dominion of the Romans, but the former wars and factions of the several states; all which were quieted by the Roman arms. Plutarch's reasoning, therefore, is directly contrary to the inference which is drawn from the fact he advances.

Polybius supposes that Greece had become more prosperous and flourishing after the establishment of the Roman yoke;* and though that historian wrote before these conquerors had degenerated, from being the patrons, to be the plunderers of mankind; yet as we find from Tacitus [*Annal.* lib. i. cap. 2.] that the severity of the emperors afterwards corrected the licence of the governors, we have no reason to think that extensive monarchy was so destructive as it is often represented to be.

We learn from Strabo, [Lib. viii. and ix.] that the Romans, from their regard to the Greeks, maintained, to his time, most of the privileges and liberties of that celebrated nation; and Nero afterwards rather increased them.† How, therefore, can we imagine that the Roman yoke was so burdensome over that part of the world? The oppression of the proconsuls was checked; and the magistracies in Greece being all bestowed, in the several cities, by the free votes of the people, there was no necessity for the competitors to attend the Emperor's court. If great numbers were to seek their fortunes in Rome, and advance themselves by learning or eloquence, the commodities of their native country, many of them would return with the fortunes which they had acquired, and thereby enrich the Grecian commonwealths.

But Plutarch says, that the general depopulation had been more sensibly felt in Greece than in any other country. How is this reconcilable to its superior privileges and advantages?

Besides, this passage, by proving too much, really proves nothing. *Only three thousand men able to bear arms in all Greece!* Who can admit so strange a proposition, especially if we consider the great number of Greek cities, whose names still remain in history, and which are mentioned by writers long after the age of Plutarch? There are there surely ten times more people at present, when there scarcely remains a city in all the bounds of ancient Greece. That country is still tolerably cultivated, and furnishes a sure supply of corn, in case of a scarcity in Spain, Italy, or the south of France.

* Lib. ii. cap. 62. It may perhaps be imagined, that Polybius, being dependent on Rome, would naturally extol the Roman dominion. But, 1. Polybius, though one sees sometimes instances of his caution, discovers no symptoms of flattery. 2. This opinion is only delivered in a single stroke, by the bye, while he is intent upon another subject; and it is allowed, if there be any suspicion of an author's insincerity, that these oblique propositions discover his real opinion better than his more formal and direct assertions.

† Plutarch. *De his qui sero a Numine puniuntur.*

We may observe, that the ancient frugality of the Greeks, and their equality of property, still subsisted during the age of Plutarch, as appears from Lucian [*De mercede conductis.*] Nor is there any ground to imagine, that that country was possessed by a few masters, and a great number of slaves.

It is probable, indeed, that military discipline, being entirely useless, was extremely neglected in Greece after the establishment of the Roman empire; and if these commonwealths, formerly so warlike and ambitious, maintained each of them a small city guard, to prevent mobbish disorders, it is all they had occasion for: and these, perhaps, did not amount to 3,000 men, throughout all Greece. I own, that, if Plutarch had this fact in his eye, he is here guilty of a gross paralogism, and assigns causes no wise proportioned to the effects. But is it so great a prodigy, that an author should fall into a mistake of this nature?*

But whatever force may remain in this passage of Plutarch, we shall endeavour to counterbalance it by as remarkable a passage in Diodorus Siculus, where the historian, after mentioning Ninus' army of 1,700,000 foot and 200,000 horse, endeavours to support the credibility of this account by some posterior facts; and adds, that we must not form a notion of the ancient populousness of mankind from the present emptiness and depopulation which is spread over the world. [Lib. ii.] Thus an author, who lived at that very period of antiquity which is represented as most populous,† complains of the desolation which then prevailed, gives the preference to former times, and has recourse to ancient fables as a foundation for his opinion. The humour of blaming the present, and admiring the past, is strongly rooted in human nature, and has an influence even on persons endued with the profoundest judgment and most extensive learning.

* I must confess that that discourse of Plutarch concerning the silence of the oracles is in general of so odd a texture and so unlike his other productions, that one is at a loss what judgment to form of it. It is written in dialogue, which is a method of composition that Plutarch commonly but little affects. The personages he introduces advance very wild, absurd, and contradictory opinions, more like the visionary systems or ravings of Plato than the plain sense of Plutarch. There runs also through the whole an air of superstition and credulity, which resembles very little the spirit that appears in other philosophical compositions of that author. For it is remarkable, that though Plutarch be an historian as superstitious as Herodotus or Livy, yet there is scarcely, in all antiquity, a philosopher less superstitious, excepting Cicero and Lucian. I must therefore confess, that a passage of Plutarch, cited from this discourse, has much less authority with me, than if it had been found in most of his other compositions.

There is only one other discourse of Plutarch liable to like objections, to wit, that *concerning those whose punishment is delayed by the Deity*. It is also writ in dialogue, contains like superstitious, wild visions, and seems to have been chiefly composed in rivalship to Plato, particularly his last book *de republica*.

And here I cannot but observe, that Fontenelle, a writer eminent for candour, seems to have departed a little from his usual character, when he endeavours to throw a ridicule upon Plutarch on account of passages to be met with in this dialogue concerning oracles. The absurdities here put into the mouths of the several personages are not to be ascribed to Plutarch. He makes them refute each other; and, in general, he seems to intend the ridiculing of those very opinions, which Fontenelle would ridicule him for maintaining. *Histoire des oracles.*

† He was cotemporary with Cæsar and Augustus.

XXXIV.—OF THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT.

As no party, in the present age, can well support a philosophical or speculative system of principles annexed to its political or practical one, we accordingly find, that each of the factions, into which this nation is divided, has reared up a fabric of the former kind, in order to protect and cover that scheme of actions, which it pursues. The people being commonly very rude builders, especially in this speculative way, and more especially still when actuated by party zeal, it is natural to imagine, that their workmanship must be a little unshapely, and discover evident marks of that violence and hurry, in which it was raised. The one party, by tracing up government to the Deity, endeavour to render it so sacred and inviolate, that it must be little less than sacrilege, however tyrannical it may become, to touch or invade it, in the smallest article. The other party, by founding government altogether on the consent of the People, suppose that there is a kind of *original contract*, by which the subjects have tacitly reserved the power of resisting the sovereign, whenever they find themselves aggrieved by that authority, with which they have, for certain purposes, voluntarily entrusted him. These are the speculative principles of the two parties; and these too are the practical consequences to be deduced from them.

I shall venture to affirm, *that both these systems of speculative principles are just, though not in the sense intended by the parties*: and, *that both the schemes of practical consequences are prudent, though not in the extremes, to which each party, in opposition to the other, has commonly endeavoured to carry them.*

That the Deity is the ultimate author of all government, will never be denied by any, who admit a general providence, and allow, that all events in the universe are conducted by an uniform plan, and directed to wise purposes. As it is impossible for the human race to subsist, at least in any comfortable and secure state, without the protection of government, this institution must certainly have been intended by that beneficent Being, who means the good of all his creatures: and as it has universally, in fact, taken place in all countries, and all ages; we may conclude, with still greater certainty, that it was intended by that omniscient Being, who can never be deceived by any event or operation. But since he gave rise to it, not by any particular or miraculous interposition, but by his concealed and universal efficacy, a sovereign cannot, properly speaking, be called his vicegerent in any other sense than every power or force, being derived from him, may be said to act by his commission. Whatever actually happens is comprehended in the general plan or intention of Providence: nor has

the greatest and most lawful prince any more reason, upon that account, to plead a peculiar sacredness or inviolable authority, than an inferior magistrate, or even an usurper, or even a robber and a pirate. The same Divine Superintendant, who, for wise purposes, invested a Titus or a Trajan with authority, did also, for purposes no doubt equally wise, though unknown, bestow power on a Borgia or an Angria. The same causes, which gave rise to the sovereign power in every state, established likewise every petty jurisdiction in it, and every limited authority. A constable, therefore, no less than a king, acts by a divine commission, and possesses an indefeasible right.

When we consider how nearly equal all men are in their bodily force, and even in their mental powers and faculties, till cultivated by education, we must necessarily allow, that nothing but their own consent could, at first, associate them together, and subject them to any authority. The people, if we trace government to its first origin in the woods and deserts, are the source of all power and jurisdiction, and voluntarily, for the sake of peace and order, abandoned their native liberty, and received laws from their equal and companion. The conditions, upon which they were willing to submit, were either expressed, or were so clear and obvious, that it might well be esteemed superfluous to express them. If this, then, be meant by the *original contract*, it cannot be denied, that all government is, at first, founded on a contract, and that the most ancient rude combinations of mankind were formed chiefly by that principle. In vain, are we asked in what records this charter of our liberties is registered. It was not written on parchment, nor yet on leaves or barks of trees. It preceded the use of writing and all the other civilized arts of life. But we trace it plainly in the nature of man, and in the equality, or something approaching equality, which we find in all the individuals of that species. The force, which now prevails, and which is founded on fleets and armies, is plainly political, and derived from authority, the effect of established government. A man's natural force consists only in the vigour of his courage, which could never subject multitudes to the command of one. Nothing but their own consent, and their sense of the advantages resulting from peace and order, could have had that influence.

Yet even this consent was long very imperfect, and could not be the basis of a regular administration. The chieftain, who had probably acquired his influence during the continuance of war, ruled more by persuasion than command, and till he could employ force to reduce the refractory and disobedient, the society could scarcely be said to have attained a state of civil government. No compact or agreement, it is evident, was expressly formed for general submission, an idea far beyond the comprehension of savages: each exertion of authority in the chieftain must have been particular, and called forth by the present exigencies of the case: the sensible utility, resulting from his interposi-

sition, made these exertions become daily more frequent, and their frequency gradually produced an habitual and, if you please to call it so, a voluntary, and therefore precarious, acquiescence in the people.

But philosophers, who have embraced a party (if that be not a contradiction in terms) are not contented with these concessions. They assert, not only that government in its earliest infancy arose from consent, or rather the voluntary acquiescence of the people, but also, that, even at present, when it has attained its full maturity, it rests on no other foundation They affirm, that all men are still born equal, and owe allegiance to no prince or government, unless bound by the obligation and sanction of a *promise* And as no man, without some equivalent, would forego the advantages of his native liberty, and subject himself to the will of another, this promise is always understood to be conditional, and imposes on him no obligation, unless he meet with justice and protection from his sovereign These advantages the sovereign promises him in return, and if he fail in the execution, he has broken, on his part the articles of engagement, and has thereby freed his subject from all obligations to allegiance Such, according to these philosophers, is the foundation of all authority in every government, and such is the right of resistance, possessed by every subject.

But would these reasoners look abroad into the world, they would meet with nothing that, in the least, corresponds to their ideas, or can warrant so refined and philosophical a system On the contrary, we find, every where, princes, who claim their subjects as their property, and assert their independent right of sovereignty, from conquest or succession We find also, everywhere, subjects, who acknowledge this right in their prince, and suppose themselves born under obligations of obedience to a certain sovereign, as much as under the ties of reverence and duty to certain parents These connections are always conceived to be equally independent of our consent, in Persia and China, in France and Spain, and even in Holland and England, wherever the doctrines above mentioned have not been carefully inculcated Obedience or subjection becomes so familiar, that most men never make any inquiry about its origin or cause, more than about the principle of gravity, resistance, or the most universal laws of nature Or if curiosity ever move them, as soon as they learn, that they themselves or their ancestors have, for several ages, or from time immemorial, been subject to such a form of government or such a family, they immediately acquiesce, and acknowledge their obligation to allegiance. Were you to preach, in most parts of the world, that political connections are founded altogether on voluntary consent or a mutual promise the magistrate would soon imprison you, as seditious, for loosening the ties of obedience; if your friends did not before shut you up as delirious, for advancing such absurdities It is strange, that an act of the mind,

which every individual is supposed to have formed, and after he came to the use of reason too, otherwise it could have no authority, that this act, I say, should be so much unknown to all of them, that, over the face of the whole earth, there scarcely remain any traces or memory of it.

But the contract, on which government is founded, is said to be the *original contract*, and consequently may be supposed too old to fall under the knowledge of the present generation. If the agreement, by which savage men first associated and conjoined their force, be here meant, this is acknowledged to be real; but being so ancient, and being obliterated by a thousand changes of government and princes, it cannot now be supposed to retain any authority. If we would say any thing to the purpose, we must assert, that every particular government, which is lawful, and which imposes any duty of allegiance on the subject, was, at first, founded on consent and a voluntary compact. But besides that this supposes the consent of the fathers to bind the children, even to the most remote generations (which republican writers will never allow), besides this, I say, it is not justified by history or experience, in any age or country of the world.

Almost all the governments, which exist at present, or of which there remains any record in history, have been founded originally, either on usurpation or conquest, or both, without any pretence of a fair consent, or voluntary subjection of the people. When an artful and bold man is placed at the head of an army or faction, it is often easy for him, by employing, sometimes violence, sometimes false pretences, to establish his dominion over a people a hundred times more numerous than his partizans. He allows no such open communication, that his enemies can know, with certainty, their number or force. He gives them no leisure to assemble together in a body to oppose him. Even all those, who are the instruments of his usurpation, may wish his fall; but their ignorance of each other's intention keeps them in awe, and is the sole cause of his security. By such arts as these, many governments have been established; and this is all the *original contract* which they have to boast of.

The face of the earth is continually changing, by the increase of small kingdoms into great empires, by the dissolution of great empires into smaller kingdoms, by the planting of colonies, by the migration of tribes. Is there any thing discoverable in all these events, but force and violence? Where is the mutual agreement or voluntary association so much talked of?

Even the smoothest way, by which a nation may receive a foreign master, by marriage or a will, is not extremely honourable for the people; but supposes them to be disposed of, like a dowry or a legacy, according to the pleasure or interest of their rulers.

But where no force interposes, and election takes place; what is

this election so highly vaunted? It is either the combination of a few great men, who decide for the whole, and will allow of no opposition or it is the fury of a multitude, that follow a seditious ringleader, who is not known, perhaps, to a dozen among them, and who owes his advancement merely to his own impudence, or to the momentary caprice of his fellows

Are these disorderly elections, which are rare too, of such mighty authority, as to be the only lawful foundation of all government and allegiance?

In reality, there is not a more terrible event, than a total dissolution of government, which gives liberty to the multitude, and makes the determination or choice of a new establishment depend upon a number, which nearly approaches to that of the body of the people for it never comes entirely to the whole body of them Every wise man, then, wishes to see, at the head of a powerful and obedient army, a general, who may speedily seize the prize, and give to the people a master, which they are so unfit to choose for themselves. So little correspondent in fact and reality to those philosophical notions.

Let not the establishment at the *Revolution* deceive us, or make us so much in love with a philosophical origin to government, as to imagine all others monstrous and irregular Even that event was far from corresponding to these refined ideas It was only the succession, and that only in the regal part of the government, which was then changed and it was only the majority of seven hundred, who determined that change for near ten millions. I doubt not, indeed, but the bulk of these ten millions acquiesced willingly in the determination but was the matter left, in the least, to their choice? Was it not justly supposed to be, from that moment, decided, and every man punished, who refused to submit to the new sovereign? How otherwise could the matter have ever been brought to any issue or conclusion

The republic of Athens was, I believe, the most extensive democracy that we read of in history yet if we make the requisite allowances for the women, the slaves, and the strangers, we shall find, that that establishment was not, at first, made, nor any law ever voted, by a tenth part of those who were bound to pay obedience to it not to mention the islands and foreign dominions, which the Athenians claimed as theirs by right of conquest. And as it is well known, that popular assemblies in that city were always full of licence and disorder, notwithstanding the institutions and laws by which they were checked how much more disorderly must they prove, where they form not the established constitution, but meet tumultuously on the dissolution of the ancient government, in order to give rise to a new one? how chimerical must it be to talk of a choice in such circumstances?

The Achæans enjoyed the freest and most perfect democracy of all antiquity; yet they employed force to oblige some cities to enter into their league, as we learn from Polybius [Lib. ii. cap. 38.]

Harry IV. and Harry VII. of England, had really no title to the throne but a parliamentary election; yet they never would acknowledge it, lest they should thereby weaken their authority. Strange, if the only real foundation of all authority be consent and promise?

It is in vain to say, that all governments are or should be at first, founded on popular consent, as much as the necessity of human affairs will admit. This favours entirely my pretension. I maintain, that human affairs will never admit of this consent, seldom of the appearance of it. But that conquest or usurpation, that is, in plain terms, force, by dissolving the ancient governments, is the origin of almost all the new ones, which were ever established in the world. And that in the few cases, where consent may seem to have taken place, it was commonly so irregular, so confined, or so much intermixed either with fraud or violence, that it cannot have any great authority.

My intention here is not to exclude the consent of the people from being one just foundation of government where it has place. I only pretend, that it has very seldom had place in any degree, and never almost in its full extent. And that therefore some other foundation of government must also be admitted.

Were all men possessed of so inflexible a regard to justice, that, of themselves, they would totally abstain from the properties of others, they had for ever remained in a state of absolute liberty, without subjection to any magistrate or political society: but this is a state of perfection, of which human nature is justly deemed incapable. Again, were all men possessed of so perfect an understanding as always to know their own interests, no form of government had ever been submitted to, but what was established on consent, and was fully canvassed by every member of the society: but this state of perfection is likewise much superior to human nature. Reason, history, and experience shew us, that all political societies have had an origin much less accurate and regular: and were one to choose a period of time, when the people's consent was the least regarded in public transactions, it would be precisely on the establishment of a new government. In a settled constitution, their inclinations are often consulted; but during the fury of revolutions, conquests, and public convulsions, military force or political craft usually decides the controversy.

When a new government is established, by whatever means, the people are commonly dissatisfied with it, and pay obedience more from fear and necessity, than from any idea of allegiance or of moral

obligation The prince is watchful and jealous, and must carefully guard against every beginning or appearance of insurrection. Time, by degrees, removes all these difficulties, and accustoms the nation to regard, as their lawful or native princes that family, which, at first, they considered as usurpers or foreign conquerors In order to found this opinion, they have no recourse to any notion of voluntary consent or promise, which they know, never was, in this case, eith expected or demanded The original establishment was formed violence, and submitted to from necessity The subsequent administration is also supported by power, and acquiesced in by the people, not as a matter of choice, but of obligation They imagine not, that their consent gives their prince a title but they willingly consent, because they think, that from long possession, he has acquired a title, independent of their choice or inclination

Should it be said, that, by living under the dominion of a prince, which one might leave, every individual has given a tacit consent to his authority, and promised him obedience, it may be answered, that such an implied consent can only have place, where a man imagines, that the matter depends on his choice But where he thinks (as all mankind do who are born under established governments) that by his birth he owes allegiance to a certain prince or certain form of government, it would be absurd to infer a consent or choice, which he expressly, in this case, renounces and disclaims

Can we seriously say, that a poor peasant or artizan has a free choice to leave his country, when he knows no foreign language or manners, and lives, from day to day, by the small wages which he acquires? We may as well assert, that man by remaining in a vessel, freely consents to the dominion of the master, though he was carried on board while asleep, and must leap into the ocean, and perish, the moment he leaves her

What if the prince forbid his subjects to quit his dominions, as in Tiberius' time, it was regarded as a crime in a Roman knight that he had attempted to fly to the Parthians, in order to escape the tyranny of that emperor? [Tacit Ann lib vi cap 14] Or as the ancient Muscovites prohibited all travelling under pain of death? And did a prince observe, that were many of his subjects seized with the frenzy of migrating to foreign countries, he would doubtless, with great reason and justice, restrain them, in order to prevent the depopulation of his own kingdom Would he forfeit the allegiance of all his subjects, by so wise and reasonable a law? Yet the freedom of their choice is surely, in that case, ravished from them.

A company of men, who should leave their native country, in order to people some inhabited region, might dream of recovering their native freedom; but they would soon find, that their prince still laid claim to them, and called them his subjects, even in their new

settlement. And in this he would but act comformably to the common ideas of mankind

The truest *tacit* consent of this kind, that is ever observed, is when a foreigner settles in any country, and is before-hand acquainted with the prince, and government, and laws to which he must submit yet is his allegiance, though more voluntary, much less expected or depended on, than that of a natural born subject On the contrary, his native prince still asserts a claim to him And if he punish not the renegade, when he seizes him in war with his new prince's commission, this clemency is not founded on the municipal law, which in all countries condemns the prisoner, but on the consent of princes, who have agreed to this indulgence, in order to prevent reprisals.

Did one generation of men go off the stage at once, and another succeed, as is the case with silk worms and butterflies, the new race, if they had sense enough to chuse their government, which surely is never the case with men, might voluntarily, and by general consent, establish their own form of civil polity, without any regard to the laws or precedents which prevailed among their ancestors But as human society is in perpetual flux, one man every hour going out of the world, another coming into it, it is necessary, in order to preserve stability in government, that the new brood should conform themselves to the established constitution and nearly follow the path which their fathers, treading in the footsteps of theirs, had marked out to them Some innovations must necessarily have place in every human institution, and it is happy where the enlightened genius of the age give these a direction to the side of reason, liberty and justice but violent innovations no individual is entitled to make they are even dangerous to be attempted by the legislature more ill than good is ever to be expected from them and if history affords examples to the contrary, they are not to be drawn into precedent, and are only to be regarded as proofs, that the science of politics affords few rules, which will not admit of some exception, and which may not sometimes be controlled by fortune and accidents The violent innovations in the reign of Henry VIII proceeded from an imperious monarch, seconded by the appearance of legislative authority those in the reign of Charles I were derived from faction and fanaticism, and both of them have proved happy in the issue But even the former were long the source of many disorders, and still more dangers, and if the measures of allegiance were to be taken from the latter, a total anarchy must have place in human society, and a final period at once be put to every government.

Suppose, that an usurper, after having banished his lawful prince and royal family, should establish his dominion for ten or a dozen years in any country, and should preserve so exact a discipline in his troops, and so regular a disposition in his garrisons, that no insurrec-

tion had ever been raised, or even murmur heard, against his administration can it be asserted, that the people, who in their hearts abhor his treason, have tacitly consented to his authority, and promised him allegiance, merely because, from necessity, they live under his dominion? Suppose again their native prince restored, by means of an army, which he levies in foreign countries they receive him with joy and exultation, and show plainly with what reluctance they had submitted to any other yoke I may now ask, upon what foundation the prince's title stands? Not on popular consent surely for though the people willingly acquiesce in his authority, they never imagine, that their consent made him sovereign They consent, because they apprehend him to be already, by birth, their lawful sovereign And as to that tacit consent, which may now be inferred from their living under his dominion, this is no more than what they formerly gave to the tyrant and usurper

When we assert, that all lawful government arises from the consent of the people, we certainly do them a great deal more honour than they deserve, or even expect and desire from us After the Roman dominions became too unwieldy for the republic to govern them, the people over the whole known world were extremely grateful to Augustus for that authority, which by violence he had established over them, and they shewed an equal disposition to submit to the successor whom he left them by his last will and testament It was afterwards their misfortune, that there never was, in one family, any long regular succession, but that their line of princes was continually broken, either by private assassinations or public rebellions The *prætorian* bands, on the failure of every family, set up one emperor, the legions in the East a second, those in Germany, perhaps, a third and the sword alone could decide the controversy The condition of the people, in that mighty monarchy, was to be lamented, not because the choice of the emperor was never left to them, for that was impracticable; but because they never fell under any succession of masters, who might regularly follow each other As to the violence and wars, and bloodshed, occasioned by every new settlement, these were not blameable, because they were inevitable

The house of Lancaster ruled in this island about sixty years, yet the partizans of the white rose seemed daily to multiply in England. The present establishment has taken place during a still longer period. Have all views of right in another family been utterly extinguished. even though scarce any man now alive had arrived at years of discretion when it was expelled, or could have consented to its dominion, or have promised it allegiance? A sufficient indication, surely, of the general sentiment of mankind on this head. For we blame, not the partizans of the abdicated family, merely on account of the long time during which they have preserved their imaginary loyalty. We blame

them for adhering to a family, which we affirm, has been justly expelled, and which, from the moment the new settlement took place, had forfeited all title to authority.

But would we have a more regular, at least a more philosophical, refutation of this principle of an original contract, or popular consent; perhaps the following observations may suffice.

All *moral* duties may be divided into two kinds. I. Those to which men are impelled by a natural instinct or immediate propensity, which operates on them, independent of all ideas of obligation, and of all views, either to public or private utility. Of this nature are, love of children, gratitude to benefactors, pity to the unfortunate. When we reflect on the advantage which results to society from such humane instincts, we pay them the just tribute of moral approbation and esteem: but the person, actuated by them, feels their power and influence, antecedent to any such reflection.

II. The kind of moral duties are such as are not supported by any original instinct of nature, but are performed entirely from a sense of obligation, when we consider the necessities of human society, and the impossibility of supporting it, if these duties were neglected. It is thus *justice*, or a regard to the property of others, *fidelity*, or the observance of promises, become obligatory, and acquire an authority over mankind. For as it is evident that every man loves himself better than any other person, he is naturally impelled to extend his acquisitions as much as possible; and nothing can restrain him in this propensity, but reflection and experience, by which he learns the pernicious effects of that licence, and the total dissolution of society which must ensue from it. His original inclination therefore, or instinct, is here checked and restrained by a subsequent judgment or observation.

The case is precisely the same with the political or civil duty of *allegiance*, as with the natural duties of justice and fidelity. Our primary instincts lead us, either to indulge ourselves in unlimited freedom, or to seek dominion over others: and it is reflection only which engages us to sacrifice such strong passions to the interests of peace and public order. A small degree of experience and observation suffices to teach us, that society cannot possibly be maintained without the authority of magistrates, and that this authority must soon fall into contempt, where exact obedience is not paid to it. The observation of these general and obvious interests is the source of all allegiance, and of that moral obligation which we attribute to it.

What necessity, therefore, is there to found the duty of *allegiance*, or obedience to magistrates on that of *fidelity* or a regard to promises, and to suppose that it is the consent of each individual which subjects him to government; when it appears that both allegiance and fidelity stand precisely on the same foundation, and are both submitted to by

mankind, on account of the apparent interests and necessities of human society? We are bound to obey our sovereign, it is said, because we have given a tacit promise to that purpose But why are we bound to observe our promise? It must here be asserted, that the commerce and intercourse of mankind, which are of such mighty advantage, can have no security where men pay no regard to their engagements. In like manner, may it be said, that men could not live at all in society, at least in a civilized society, without laws and magistrates and judges, to prevent the encroachments of the strong upon the weak, of the violent upon the just and equitable The obligation to allegiance being of like force and authority with the obligation to fidelity, we gain nothing by resolving the one into the other The general interests or necessities of society are sufficient to establish both

If the reason be asked of that obedience which we are bound to pay to government, I readily answer, *because society could not otherwise subsist* And this answer is clear and intelligible to all mankind Your answer is, *because we should keep our word* But besides, that no body, till trained in a philosophical system, can neither comprehend or relish this answer besides this, I say, you find yourself embarrassed, when it is asked *why are we bound to keep our word?* Nor can you give any answer, but what would immediately, without any circuit, have accounted for our obligation to allegiance

But *to whom is allegiance due? And who is our lawful sovereign?* This question is often the most difficult of any, and liable to infinite discussions When people are so happy, that they can answer, *Our present sovereign, who inherits, in a direct line, from ancestors that have governed us for many ages* This answer admits of no reply, even though historians in tracing up to the remotest antiquity, the origin of that royal family, may find, as commonly happens, that its first authority was derived from usurpation and violence. It is confessed, that private justice, or the abstinence from the properties of others, is a most cardinal virtue yet reason tells us, that there is no property in durable objects, such as land or houses, when carefully examined in passing from hand to hand, but must, in some period, have been founded on fraud and injustice The necessities of human society, neither in private nor public life, will allow of such an accurate inquiry and there is no virtue or moral duty, but what may, with facility, be refined away, if we indulge a false philosophy, in sifting and scrutinizing it, by every captious rule of logic, in every light or position, in which it may be placed

The questions with regard to private property have filled infinite volumes of law and philosophy, if in both we add the commentators to the original text, and in the end, we may safely pronounce, that many of the rules, there established, are uncertain, ambiguous, and

arbitrary. The like opinion may be formed with regard to the succession and rights of princes and forms of government. Several cases, no doubt, occur, especially in the infancy of any constitution, which admit of no determination from the laws of justice and equity: and our historian Rapin pretends, that the controversy between Edward III and Philip de Valois was of this nature, and could be decided only by an appeal to heaven, that is by war and violence.

Who shall tell me, whether Germanicus or Drusus ought to have succeeded to Tiberius, had he died, while they were both alive, without naming any of them for his successor? Ought the right of adoption to be received as equivalent to that of blood, in a nation where it had the same effect in private families, and had already in two instances, taken place in the public? Ought Germanicus to be esteemed the elder son because he was born before Drusus, or the younger, because he was adopted after the birth of his brother? Ought the right of the elder to be regarded in a nation, where he had no advantage in the succession of private families? Ought the Roman empire at that time to be deemed hereditary, because of two examples, or ought it, even so early, to be regarded as belonging to the stronger or to the present possessor, as being founded on so recent an usurpation?

Commodus mounted the throne after a pretty long succession of excellent emperors, who had acquired their title, not by birth, or public election, but by the fictitious rite of adoption. That bloody debauchee being murdered by a conspiracy, suddenly formed between his wench and her gallant, who happened at that time to be *Prætorian Præfect*, these immediately deliberated about choosing a master to human kind, to speak in the style of those ages; and they cast their eyes on Pertinax. Before the tyrant's death was known, the *Præfect* went secretly to that senator, who, on the appearance of the soldiers, imagined that his execution had been ordered by Commodus. He was immediately saluted emperor by the officer and his attendants, cheerfully proclaimed by the populace, unwillingly submitted to by the guards, formally recognized by the senate, and passively received by the provinces and armies of the empire.

The discontent of the *Prætorian* bands broke out in a sudden sedition, which occasioned the murder of that excellent prince: and the world being now without a master, and without government, the guards thought proper to set the empire formally to sale. Julian, the purchaser, was proclaimed by the soldiers, recognized by the senate, and submitted to by the people, and must also have been submitted to by the provinces, had not the envy of the legions begotten opposition and resistance. Pescennius Niger in Syria elected himself emperor, gained the tumultuary consent of his army, and was attended with the secret good-will of the senate and people of Rome. Albinus in Britain found an equal right to set up his claim, but Severus, who

governed Pannonia, prevailed in the end above both of them. This able politician and warrior, finding his own birth and dignity too much inferior to the imperial crown, professed, at first, an intention only of revenging the death of Pertinax He marched as general into Italy; defeated Julian, and without being able to fix any precise commencement even of the soldiers' consent, he was from necessity acknowledged emperor by the senate and people, and fully established in his violent authority by subduing Niger and Albinus [Herodian, lib. ii]

Inter hæc Gordianus Cæsar (says Capitolinus, speaking of another period) *sublatus a militibus* Imperator *est appellatus, quia non erat alius in præsenti*. It is to be remarked, that Gordian was a boy of fourteen years of age

Frequent instances of a like nature occur in the history of the emperors; in that of Alexander's successors, and of many other countries nor can any thing be more unhappy than a despotic government of this kind, where the succession is disjointed and irregular, and must be determined, on every vacancy, by force or election. In a free government, the matter is often unavoidable, and is also much less dangerous. The interests of liberty may there frequently lead the people, in their own defence, to alter the succession of the crown. And the constitution, being compounded of parts, may still maintain a sufficient stability, by resting on the aristocratical or democratical members, though the monarchical be altered, from time to time, in order to accommodate it to the former

In an absolute government, when there is no legal prince, who has a title to the throne, it may safely be determined to belong to the first occupant. Instances of this kind are but too frequent, especially in the eastern monarchies When any race of princes expires, the will or destination of the last sovereign will be regarded as a title. Thus the edict of Louis XIV, who called the bastard princes to the succession in case of the failure of all the legitimate princes, would in such an event, have some authority * Thus the will of Charles II. disposed of the whole Spanish monarchy The cession of the ancient proprietor, especially when joined to conquest, is likewise deemed a good title. The general obligation, which binds us to government, is

* It is remarkable, that, in the remonstrance of the Duke of Bourbon and the legitimate princes, against this destination of Louis the XIV the doctrine of the *original contract* is insisted on, even in that absolute government The French nation say they, chusing Hugh Capet and his posterity to rule over them and their posterity, where the former line fails, there is a tacit right reserved to chuse a new royal family and this right is invaded by calling the bastard princes to the throne, without the consent of the nation. But the Comte de Boulainvilliers, who wrote in defence of the bastard princes, ridicules this notion of an original contract, especially when applied to Hugh Capet, who mounted the throne, says he, by the same arts, which have ever been employed by all conquerors and usurpers. He got his title, indeed, recognized by the states after he had put himself in possession: but is this a choice or a contract' The Comte de Boulainvilliers, we may observe, was a noted republican, but being a man of learning, and very conversant in history, he knew that the people were never almost consulted in these revolutions and new establishments, and that time alone bestowed right and authority on what was commonly at first founded on force and violence. —*Etat de la France*, Vol. III.

the interest and necessities of society, and this obligation is very strong. The determination of it to this or that particular prince, or form of government, is frequently more uncertain and dubious. Present possession has considerable authority in these cases, and greater than in private property, because of the disorders which attend all revolutions and changes of government

We shall only observe, before we conclude, that though an appeal to general opinion may justly, in the speculative sciences of metaphysics, natural philosophy, or astronomy, be deemed unfair and inconclusive, yet in all questions with regard to morals, as well as criticism, there is really no other standard, by which any controversy can ever be decided And nothing is a clearer proof, that a theory of this kind is erroneous, than to find, that it leads to paradoxes repugnant to the common sentiments of mankind, and to the practice and opinion of all nations and all ages The doctrine which founds all lawful government on an *original contract*, or consent of the people, is plainly of this kind, nor has the most noted of its partizans, in prosecution of it scrupled to affirm, *that absolute monarchy is inconsistent with civil society, and so can be no form of civil government at all*, [Locke on Government, chap vii sect 90,] and *that the supreme power in a state cannot take from any man, by taxes and impositions, any part of his property, without his own consent or that of his representatives* [Id chap xi sect 138 139, 140.] What authority any moral reasoning can have, which leads into opinions so wide of the general practice of mankind, in every place but this single kingdom, it is easy to determine.

The only passage I meet with in antiquity, where the obligation of obedience to government is ascribed to a promise is in Plato's *Crito* where Socrates refuses to escape from prison, because he had tacitly promised to obey the laws Thus he builds a *Tory* consequence of passive obedience on a *Whig* foundation of the original contract.

New discoveries are not to be expected in these matters. If scarce any man, till very lately, ever imagined that government was founded on compact, it is certain, that it cannot, in general, have any such foundation.

The crime of rebellion among the ancients was commonly expressed by the terms *νεωτερίζειν novas res moliri*.

XXXV.—OF PASSIVE OBEDIENCE.

In the former essay, we endeavoured to refute the *speculative* systems of politics advanced in this nation; as well the religious system of

the one party, as the philosophical of the other. We come now to examine the *practical* consequences deduced by each party, with regard to the measures of submission due to sovereigns.

As the obligation to justice is founded entirely on the interests of society, which require mutual abstinence from property, in order to preserve peace among mankind, it is evident, that, when the execution of justice would be attended with very pernicious consequences, that virtue must be suspended, and give place to public utility in such extraordinary and such pressing emergencies. The maxim, *fiat Justitia et ruat Cœlum*, let justice be performed, though the universe be destroyed, is apparently false and by sacrificing the end to the means, shews a preposterous idea of the subordination of duties. What governor of a town makes any scruple of burning the suburbs, when they facilitate the approaches of the enemy? Or what general abstains from plundering a neutral country, when the necessities of war require it, and he cannot otherwise subsist his army? The case is the same with the duty of allegiance, and common sense teaches us, that, as government binds us to obedience only on account of its tendency to public utility, that duty must always, in extraordinary cases, when public ruin would evidently attend obedience, yield to the primary and original obligation. *Salus populi suprema Lex*, the safety of the people is the supreme law. This maxim is agreeable to the sentiments of mankind in all ages: nor is any one, when he reads of the insurrections against Nero or Philip II, so infatuated with party systems, as not to wish success to the enterprise, and praise the undertakers. Even our high monarchical party, in spite of their sublime theory, are forced, in such cases, to judge, and feel, and approve, in conformity to the rest of mankind.

Resistance, therefore, being admitted in extraordinary emergencies, the question can only be among good reasoners, with regard to the degree of necessity, which can justify resistance, and render it lawful or commendable. And here I must confess, that I shall always incline to their side, who draw the bond of allegiance very close, and consider an infringement of it, as the last refuge in desperate cases, when the public is in the highest danger, from violence and tyranny. For besides the mischiefs of a civil war, which commonly attends insurrection, it is certain, that, where a disposition to rebellion appears among any people, it is one chief cause of tyranny in the rulers, and forces them into many violent measures which they never would have embraced, had every one been inclined to submission and obedience. Thus the *tyrannicide* or assassination, approved of by ancient maxims, instead of keeping tyrants and usurpers in awe, made them ten times more fierce and unrelenting, and is now justly, upon that account, abolished by the laws of nations, and universally condemned as a base and treacherous method of bringing to justice these disturbers of society.

Besides, we must consider, that as obedience is our duty in the common course of things, it ought chiefly to be inculcated; nor can any thing be more preposterous than an anxious care and solicitude in stating all the cases, in which resistance may be allowed. In like manner, though a philosopher reasonably acknowledges, in the course of an argument, that the rules of justice may be dispensed with in cases of urgent necessity, what should we think of a preacher or casuist, who should make it his chief study to find out such cases, and enforce them with all the vehemence of argument and eloquence? Would he not be better employed in inculcating the general doctrine, than in displaying the particular exceptions, which, we are, perhaps, but too much inclined, of ourselves, to embrace and to extend?

There are, however, two reasons, which may be pleaded in defence of that party among us, who have, with so much industry, propagated the maxims of resistance maxims which, it must be confessed, are, in general, so pernicious, and so destructive of civil society The *first* is, that their antagonists, carrying the doctrine of obedience to such an extravagant height, as not only never to mention the exceptions in extraordinary cases (which might, perhaps, be excusable), but even positively to exclude them, it became necessary to insist on these exceptions, and defend the rights of injured truth and liberty The *second*, and, perhaps, better reason, is founded on the nature of the British constitution and form of government.

It is almost peculiar to our constitution to establish a first magistrate with such high pre eminence and dignity, that, though limited by the laws, he is, in a manner, so far as regards his own person, above the laws, and can neither be questioned nor punished for any injury or wrong which may be committed by him His ministers alone, or those who act by his commission, are obnoxious to justice, and while the prince is thus allured, by the prospect of personal safety, to give the laws their free course, an equal security is, in effect, obtained by the punishment of lesser offenders, and at the same time a civil war is avoided, which would be the infallible consequence, were an attack, at every turn, made directly upon the sovereign But though the constitution pays this salutary compliment to the prince, it can never reasonably be understood, by that maxim to have determined its own destruction, or to have established a tame submission, where he protects his ministers, perseveres in injustice, and usurps the whole power of the commonwealth This case, indeed, is never expressly put by the laws, because it is impossible for them, in their ordinary course, to provide a remedy for it, or establish any magistrate, with superior authority, to chastise the exorbitances of the prince. But as a right without a remedy would be an absurdity; the remedy, in this case, is the extraordinary one of resistance, when affairs come to that extremity, that the constitution can be defended by it alone. Resist-

ance, therefore, must, of course, become more frequent in the British government, than in others, which are simpler, and consist of fewer parts and movements. Where the king is an absolute sovereign, he has little temptation to commit such enormous tyranny as may justly provoke rebellion But where he is limited, his imprudent ambition, without any great vices, may run him into that perilous situation. This is frequently supposed to have been the case with Charles I , and if we may now speak truth, after animosities are ceased, this was also the case with James II These were harmless, if not, in their private character, good men , but mistaking the nature of our constitution, and engrossing the whole legislative power, it became necessary to oppose them with some vehemence , and even to deprive the latter formally of that authority which he had used with such imprudence and indiscretion.

XXXVI —OF THE COALITION OF PARTIES.

TO abolish all distinctions of party may not be practicable, perhaps not desirable, in a free government. The only dangerous parties are such as entertain opposite views with regard to the essentials of government, the succession of the crown, or the more considerable privileges belonging to the several members of the constitution , where there is no room for any compromise or accommodation, and where the controversy may appear so momentous as to justify even an opposition by arms to the pretensions of antagonists Of this nature was the animosity, continued for above a century past, between the parties in England , an animosity which broke out sometimes into civil war, which occasioned violent revolutions, and which continually endangered the peace and tranquillity of the nation But as there have appeared of late the strongest symptoms of an universal desire to abolish these party distinctions this tendency to a coalition affords the most agreeable prospect of future happiness, and ought to be carefully cherished and promoted by every lover of his country.

There is not a more effectual method of promoting so good an end, than to prevent all unreasonable insult and triumph of the one party over the other, to encourage moderate opinions, to find the proper medium in all disputes, to persuade each that its antagonist may possibly be sometimes in the right, and to keep a balance in the praise or blame, which we bestow on either side. The two former essays, concerning the *original contract* and *passive obedience*, are calculated for this purpose with regard to the *philosophical* and *practical con-*

troversies between the parties, and tend to show that neither side are in these respects so fully supported by reason as they endeavour to flatter themselves. We shall proceed to exercise the same moderation with regard to the *historical* disputes between the parties, by proving that each of them was justified by plausible topics; that there was on both sides wise men, who meant well to their country; and that the past animosity between the factions had no better foundation than narrow prejudice or interested passion.

The popular party, who afterwards acquired the name of Whigs, might justify, by very specious arguments, that opposition to the crown, from which our present free constitution is derived. Though obliged to acknowledge, that precedents in favour of prerogative had uniformly taken place during many reigns before Charles I., they thought, that there was no reason for submitting any longer to so dangerous an authority. Such might have been their reasoning: as the rights of mankind are for ever to be deemed sacred, no prescription of tyranny or arbitrary power can have authority sufficient to abolish them. Liberty is a blessing so inestimable, that, wherever there appears any probability of recovering it, a nation may willingly run many hazards, and ought not even to repine at the greatest effusion of blood or dissipation of treasure. All human institutions, and none more than government, are in continual fluctuation. Kings are sure to embrace every opportunity of extending their prerogatives: and if favourable incidents be not also laid hold of for extending and securing the privileges of the people, an universal despotism must for ever prevail amongst mankind. The example of all the neighbouring nations proves, that it is no longer safe to entrust with the crown the same high prerogatives which had formerly been exercised during rude and simple ages. And though the example of many late reigns may be pleaded in favour of a power in the prince somewhat arbitrary, more remote reigns afford instances of stricter limitations imposed on the crown; and those pretensions of the parliament now branded with the title of innovations, are only a recovery of the ancient and just rights of the people.

These views, far from being odious, are surely large, and generous, and noble: to their prevalence and success the kingdom owes its liberty; perhaps its learning, its industry, commerce, and naval power: by them chiefly the English name is distinguished among the society of nations, and aspires to a rivalship with that of the freest and most illustrious commonwealths of antiquity. But as all these mighty consequences could not reasonably be foreseen at the time when the contest began, the royalists of that age wanted not specious arguments on their side, by which they could justify their defence of the then established prerogatives of the prince. We shall state the question, as it might have appeared to them at the assembling of that parliament,

which, by its violent encroachments on the crown, began the civil wars.

The only rule of government, they might have said, known and acknowledged among men, is use and practice; reason is so uncertain a guide, that it will always be exposed to doubt and controversy could it ever render itself prevalent over the people, men had always retained it as their sole rule of conduct they had still continued in the primitive, unconnected state of nature, without submitting to political government, whose sole basis is, not pure reason, but authority and precedent Dissolve these ties, you break all the bonds of civil society, and leave every man at liberty to consult his private interest, by those expedients, which his appetite, disguised under the appearance of reason, shall dictate to him The spirit of innovation is in itself pernicious, however favourable its particular object may sometimes appear a truth so obvious, that the popular party themselves are sensible of it and therefore cover their encroachments on the crown by the plausible pretence of their recovering the ancient liberties of the people

But the present prerogatives of the crown, allowing all the suppositions of that party, have been incontestibly established ever since the accession of the House of Tudor, a period which, as it now comprehends a hundred and sixty years, may be allowed sufficient to give stability to any constitution Would it not have appeared ridiculous in the reign of the Emperor Adrian, to have talked of the republican constitution as the rule of government, or to have supposed, that the former rights of the senate, and consuls and tribunes, were still subsisting

But the present claims of the English monarchs are much more favourable than those of the Roman emperors during that age. The authority of Augustus was a plain usurpation, grounded only on military violence, and forms such an epoch in the Roman history, as is obvious to every reader But if Henry VII really, as some pretend, enlarged the power of the crown, it was only by insensible acquisitions, which escaped the apprehension of the people, and have scarcely been remarked even by historians and politicians The new government, if it deserves the epithet, is an imperceptible transition from the former, is entirely engrafted on it, derives its title fully from that root, and is to be considered only as one of those gradual revolutions, to which human affairs, in every nation, will be for ever subject.

The house of Tudor, and after them that of Stuart, exercised no prerogatives but what had been claimed and exercised by the Plantagenets. Not a single branch of their authority can be said to be an innovation. The only difference is, that perhaps former kings exerted these powers only by intervals, and were not able, by reason of the opposition of their barons, to render them so steady a rule of

ministration. But the sole inference from this fact is, that those ancient times were more turbulent and seditious, and that royal authority, the constitution, and the laws, have happily of late gained the ascendant.

Under what pretence can the popular party now speak of recovering the ancient constitution? The former control over the kings was not placed in the commons, but in the barons: the people had no authority, and even little or no liberty, till the crown, by suppressing these factious tyrants, enforced the execution of the laws, and obliged all the subjects equally to respect each others rights, privileges, and properties. If we must return to the ancient barbarous and feudal constitution, let those gentlemen, who now behave themselves with so much insolence to their sovereign, set the first example. Let them make court to be admitted as retainers to a neighbouring baron, and by submitting to slavery under him, acquire some protection to themselves, together with the power of exercising rapine and oppression over their inferior slaves and villains. This was the condition of the commons among their remote ancestors.

But how far back must we go in having recourse to ancient constitutions and governments? There was a constitution still more ancient than that to which these innovators affect so much to appeal. During that period there was no *Magna Charta*: the barons themselves possessed few regular, stated privileges, and the house of commons probably had not an existence.

It is ridiculous to hear the Commons, while they are assuming, by usurpation, the whole power of government, talk of reviving the ancient institutions. Is it not known, that, though representatives received wages from their constituents, to be a member of the lower house was always considered as a burden, and an exemption from it as a privilege? Will they persuade us, that power, which, of all human acquisitions, is the most coveted, and in comparison of which, even reputation, and pleasure, and riches, are slighted, could ever be regarded as a burden by any man?

The property, acquired of late by the commons, it is said, entitles them to more power than their ancestors enjoyed. But to what is this increase of their property owing, but to an increase of their liberty and their security? Let them therefore acknowledge, that their ancestors, while the crown was restrained by the seditious barons, really enjoyed that liberty with moderation, and not forfeit it by new exorbitant claims, and by rendering it a pretence for endless innovations.

The true rule of government is the present established practice of the age. That has most authority, because it is recent: it is also best known, for the same reason. Who has assured those tribunes, that the Plantagenets did not exercise as high acts of authority as the Tudors? Historians, they say, do not mention them. But historians

are also silent with regard to the chief exertions of prerogative by the Tudors. Where any power or prerogative is fully and undoubtedly established, the exercise of it passes for a thing of course, and readily escapes the notice of history and annals. Had we no other monuments of Elizabeth's reign, than what are preserved even by Cambden, the most copious, judicious, and exact of our historians, we should be entirely ignorant of the most important maxims of her government.

Was not the present monarchical government, in its full extent, authorised by lawyers, recommended by divines, acknowledged by politicians, acquiesced in, nay passionately cherished, by the people in general; and all this during a period of at least a hundred and sixty years, and, till of late, without the smallest murmur of controversy? This general consent, surely, during so long a time, must be sufficient to render a constitution legal and valid. If the origin of all power be derived, as is pretended, from the people, here is their consent in the fullest and the most ample terms that can be desired or imagined.

But the people must not pretend, because they can, by their consent, lay the foundations of government, that therefore they are permitted, at their pleasure, to overthrow and subvert them. There is no end of these seditious and arrogant claims. The power of the crown is now openly struck at: the nobility are also in visible peril: the gentry will soon follow: the popular leaders, who will then assume the name of gentry, will next be exposed to danger: and the people themselves, having become incapable of civil government, and lying under the restraint of no authority, must, for the sake of peace, admit, instead of their legal and mild monarchs, a succession of military and despotic tyrants.

These consequences are the more to be dreaded, as the present fury of the people, though glossed over by pretensions to civil liberty, is in reality incited by the fanaticism of religion; a principle the most blind, headstrong, and ungovernable, by which human nature can possibly be actuated. Popular rage is dreadful, from whatever motive derived: but must be attended with the most pernicious consequences, when it arises from a principle, which disclaims all control by human law, reason, or authority.

These are the arguments, which each party may make use of to justify the conduct of their predecessors, during that great crisis. The event, if that can be admitted as a reason, has shown, that the arguments of the popular party were better founded; but perhaps, according to the established maxims of lawyers and politicians, the views of the royalists ought, beforehand, to have appeared more solid, more safe, and more legal. But this is certain, that the greater moderation we now employ in representing past events, the nearer

shall we be to produce a full coalition of the parties, and an entire acquiescence in our present establishment. Moderation is of advantage to every establishment: nothing but zeal can overturn a settled power: and an over-active zeal in friends is apt to beget a like spirit of antagonists. The transition from a moderate opposition against an establishment, to an entire acquiescence in it, is easy and insensible.

There are many invincible arguments, which should induce the malcontent party to acquiesce entirely in the present settlement of the constitution. They now find, that the spirit of civil liberty, though at first connected with religious fanaticism, could purge itself from that pollution, and appear under a more genuine and engaging aspect; a friend to toleration, and encourager of all the enlarged and generous sentiments that do honour to human nature. They may observe, that the popular claims of prerogative, could still maintain a due respect to monarchy, the nobility, and to all ancient institutions. Above all, they must be sensible, that the very principle, which made the strength of their party, and from which it derived its chief authority, has now deserted them, and gone over to their antagonists. The plan of liberty is settled; its happy effects are proved by experience; a long tract of time has given it stability; and whoever would attempt to overturn it, and to recal the past government or abdicated family, would, besides other more criminal imputations, be exposed, in their turn, to the reproach of faction and innovation. While they peruse the history of past events, they ought to reflect, both that those rights of the crown are long since annihilated, and that the tyranny, and violence, and oppression, to which they often gave rise, are ills, from which the established liberty of the constitution has now at last happily protected the people. These reflections will prove a better security to our freedom and privileges, than to deny, contrary to the clearest evidence of facts, that such regal powers ever had an existence. There is not a more effectual method of betraying a cause, than to lay the stress of the argument on a wrong place, and by disputing an untenable post, enure the adversaries to success and victory.

XXXVII.—OF THE PROTESTANT SUCCESSION.

I SUPPOSE, that a member of Parliament in the reign of King William or Queen Anne, while the establishment of the *Protestant Succession* was yet uncertain, was deliberating concerning the party he would chuse in that important question, and weighing, with impartiality, the

advantages and disadvantages on each side, I believe the following particulars would have entered into his consideration.

He would easily perceive the great advantage resulting from the restoration of the Stuart family, by which we should preserve the succession clear and undisputed, free from a pretender, with such a specious title as that of blood, which, with the multitude, is always the claim, the strongest and most easily comprehended. It is in vain to say, as many have done, that the question with regard to *governors*, independent of *government*, is frivolous, and little worth disputing, much less fighting about. The generality of mankind never will enter into these sentiments; and it is much happier, I believe, for society, that they do not, but rather continue in their natural prepossessions. How could stability be preserved in any monarchical government (which, though perhaps not the best, is, and always has been, the most common of any), unless men had so passionate a regard for the true heir of their royal family; and even though he be weak in understanding, or infirm in years, gave him so sensible a preference above persons the most accomplished in shining talents, or celebrated for great achievements? Would not every popular leader put in his claim at every vacancy, or even without any vacancy; and the kingdom become the theatre of perpetual wars and convulsions? The condition of the Roman empire, surely, was not, in this respect, much to be envied; nor is that of the *Eastern* nations, who pay little regard to the titles of their sovereign, but sacrifice them, every day, to the caprice or momentary humour of the populace or soldiery. It is but a foolish wisdom, which is so carefully displayed in undervaluing princes, and placing them on a level with the meanest of mankind. To be sure, an anatomist finds no more in the greatest monarch than in the lowest peasant or day-labourer; and a moralist may, perhaps, frequently find less. But what do all these reflections tend to? We, all of us, still retain these prejudices in favour of birth and family; and neither in our serious occupations, nor most careless amusements, can we ever get entirely rid of them. A tragedy that should represent the adventures of sailors, or porters, or even of private gentlemen, would presently disgust us; but one that introduces kings and princes, acquires in our eyes an air of importance and dignity. Or should a man be able, by his superior wisdom, to get entirely above such prepossessions, he would soon, by means of the same wisdom, again bring himself down to them, for the sake of society, whose welfare he would perceive to be intimately connected with them. Far from endeavouring to undeceive the people in this particular, he would cherish such sentiments of reverence to their princes, as requisite to preserve a due subordination in society. And though the lives of twenty thousand men be often sacrificed to maintain a king in possession of his throne, or preserve the right of succession undisturbed, he entertains no in-

dignation at the loss, on pretence that every individual of these was, perhaps, in himself, as valuable as the prince he served. He considers the consequences of violating the hereditary rights of kings: consequences, which may be felt for many centuries; while the loss of several thousand men brings so little prejudice to a large kingdom, that it may not be perceived a few years after.

The advantages of the Hanover succession are of an opposite nature, and arise from this very circumstance, that it violates hereditary right; and places on the throne a prince, to whom birth gave no title to that dignity. It is evident, from the history of this island, that the privileges of the people have, during near two centuries, been continually upon the increase, by the division of the church lands, by the alienations of the barons' estates, by the progress of trade, and above all by the happiness of our situation, which, for a long time, gave us sufficient security, without any standing army or military establishment. On the contrary, public liberty has, almost in every other nation of Europe, been, during the same period, extremely on the decline; while the people were disgusted at the hardships of the old feudal militia, and rather chose to entrust their prince with mercenary armies, which he easily turned against themselves. It was nothing extraordinary, therefore, that some of our British sovereigns mistook the nature of the constitution, at least the genius of the people; and as they embraced all the favourable precedents left them by their ancestors, they overlooked all those which were contrary, and which supposed a limitation in our government. They were encouraged in this mistake by the example of all the neighbouring princes, who bearing the same title or appellation, and being adorned with the same ensigns of authority, naturally led them to claim the same powers and prerogatives. It appears from the speeches and proclamations of James I. and the whole train of that prince's actions, as well as his son's, that he regarded the English government as a simple monarchy, and never imagined that any considerable part of his subjects entertained a contrary idea. This opinion made those monarchs discover their pretensions, without preparing any force to support them; and even without reserve or disguise, which are always employed by those who enter upon any new subject, or endeavour to innovate in any government. The flattery of courtiers farther confirmed their prejudices; and above all, that of the clergy, who from several passages of *Scripture*, and these wrested too, had erected a regular and avowed system of arbitrary power. The only method of destroying, at once, all these high claims and pretensions, was to depart from the true hereditary line, and chuse a prince, who, being plainly a creature of the public, and receiving the crown on conditions, expressed and avowed, found his authority established on the same bottom with the privileges of the people. By electing him in the royal line, we cut off all hopes of ambitious subjects,

who might, in future emergencies, disturb the government by their cabals and pretensions: by rendering the crown hereditary in his family, we avoided all the inconveniencies of elective monarchy; and by excluding the lineal heir, we secured all our constitutional limitations, and rendered our government uniform and of a piece. The people cherish monarchy, because protected by it: the monarch favours liberty, because created by it. And thus every advantage is obtained by the new establishment, as far as human skill and wisdom can extend itself.

These are the separate advantages of fixing the succession, either in the house of Stuart, or in that of Hanover. There are also disadvantages in each establishment, which an impartial patriot would ponder and examine, in order to form a just judgment upon the whole.

The disadvantages of the protestant succession consist in the foreign dominions, which are possessed by the princes of the Hanover line, and which, it might be supposed, would engage us in the intrigues and wars of the Continent, and lose us, in some measure, the inestimable advantage we possess, of being surrounded and guarded by the sea, which we command. The disadvantages of recalling the abdicated family consist chiefly in their religion, which is more prejudicial to society than that established among us, is contrary to it, and affords no toleration, or peace, or security, to any other communion.

It appears to me, that these advantages and disadvantages are allowed on both sides; at least, by every one who is at all susceptible of argument or reasoning. No subject, however loyal, pretends to deny, that the disputed title and foreign dominions of the present royal family are a loss. Nor is there any partizan of the Stuarts, but will confess, that the claim of hereditary, indefeasible right, and the Roman Catholic religion, are also disadvantages in that family. It belongs, therefore to a philosopher alone, who is of neither party, to put all the circumstances in the scale, and assign to each of them its proper poise and influence. Such a one will readily, at first, acknowledge, that all political questions are infinitely complicated, and, that there scarcely ever occurs, in any deliberation, a choice, which is either purely good, or purely ill. Consequences, mixed and varied, may be foreseen to flow from every measure: and many consequences, unforeseen, do always, in fact, result from every one. Hesitation, and reserve, and suspense, are, therefore, the only sentiments he brings to this essay or trial. Or if he indulges any passion, it is that of derision against the ignorant multitude, who are always clamorous and dogmatical, even in the nicest questions, of which, from want of temper, perhaps still more than of understanding, they are altogether unfit judges.

But to say something more determinate on this head, the follow-

ing reflections will, I hope, show the temper, if not the understanding, of a philosopher.

Were we to judge merely by first appearances, and by past experience, we must allow that the advantage of a parliamentary title in the house of Hanover are greater than those of an undisputed hereditary title in the house of Stuart, and that our fathers acted wisely in preferring the former to the latter. So long as the house of Stuart ruled in Great Britain, which, with some interruption, was above eighty years, the government was kept in a continual fever, by the contention between the privileges of the people and the prerogative of the crown. If arms were dropped, the noise of disputes continued: or if these were silenced, jealously still corroded the heart, and threw the nation into an unnatural ferment and disorder. And while we were thus occupied in domestic disputes, a foreign power, dangerous to public liberty, erected itself in Europe, without any opposition from us, and even sometimes with our assistance.

But during these last sixty years, when a parliamentary establishment has taken place, whatever factions may have prevailed, either among the people or in public assemblies, the whole force of our constitution has always fallen to one side, and an uninterrupted harmony has been preserved between our princes and our parliaments. Public liberty, with internal peace and order, has flourished almost without interruption: trade and manufactures, and agriculture, have increased: the arts and sciences, and philosophy, have been cultivated. Even religious parties have been necessitated to lay aside their mutual rancour, and the glory of the nation has spread itself all over Europe, derived equally from our progress in the arts of peace, and from valour and success in war. So long and so glorious a period no nation almost can boast of: nor is there another instance in the whole history of mankind, that so many millions of people have, during such a space of time, been held together, in a manner so free, so rational, and so suitable to the dignity of human nature.

But though this recent experience seems clearly to decide in favour of the present establishment, there are some circumstances to be thrown into the other scale, and it is dangerous to regulate our judgment by one event or example,

We have had two rebellions during the flourishing period above mentioned, besides plots and conspiracies without number. And if none of these have produced any very fatal event, we may ascribe our escape chiefly to the narrow genius of those princes who disputed our establishment; and we may esteem ourselves so far fortunate. But the claims of the banished family, I fear, are not yet antiquated; and who can foretel, that future attempts will produce no greater disorder?

The disputes between privilege and prerogative may easily be composed by laws, and votes, and conferences, and concessions; where

there is tolerable temper or prudence on both sides, or on either side. Among contending titles, the question can only be determined by the sword, and by devastation, and by civil war

A prince, who fills the throne with a disputed title, dare not arm his subjects, the only method of securing a people fully, both against domestic oppression and foreign conquest

Notwithstanding our riches and renown, what a critical escape did we make, by the late peace, from dangers, which were owing not so much to bad conduct and ill success in war, as to the pernicious practice of mortgaging our finances, and the still more pernicious maxim of never paying off our incumbrances? Such fatal measures would not probably have been embraced, had it not been to secure a precarious establishment

But to convince us, that an hereditary title is to be embraced rather than a parliamentary one, which is not supported by any other views or motives, a man needs only transport himself back to the era of the restoration, and suppose that he had had a seat in that parliament which recalled the royal family, and put a period to the greatest disorder that ever arose from the opposite pretensions of prince and people What would have been thought of one, that had proposed, at that time, to set aside Charles II and settle the crown on the duke of York or Gloucester, merely in order to exclude all high claims, like those of their father and grandfather? Would not such a one have been regarded as an extravagant projector, who loved dangerous remedies, and could tamper and play with a government and national constitution, like a quack with a sickly patient

In reality, the reason assigned by the nation for excluding the race of Stuart, and so many other branches of the royal family, is not on account of their hereditary title, (a reason, which would, to vulgar apprehensions, have appeared altogether absurd), but on account of their religion, which leads us to compare the disadvantages above mentioned in each establishment.

I confess, that, considering the matter in general, it were much to be wished that our prince had no foreign dominions, and could confine all his attention to the government of this island. For not to mention some real inconveniences that may result from territories on the continent, they afford such a handle for calumny and defamation, as is greedily seized by the people, always disposed to think ill of their superiors. It must, however, be acknowledged, that Hanover is, perhaps, the spot of ground in Europe the least inconvenient for a King of England. It lies in the heart of Germany, at a distance from the great powers, which are our natural rivals it is protected by the laws of the empire, as well as by the arms of its own sovereign; and it serves only to connect us more closely with the house of Austria, our natural ally.

The religious persuasion of the house of Stuart is an inconvenience of a much deeper die, and would threaten us with much more dismal consequences. The Roman Catholic religion, with its train of priests and friars, is more expensive than ours; even though unaccompanied with its natural attendants of inquisitors, and stakes, and gibbets, it is less tolerating: and not content with dividing the sacerdotal from the regal office (which must be prejudicial to any state), it bestows the former on a foreigner, who has always a separate interest from that of the public, and may often have an opposite one.

But were this religion ever so advantageous to society, it is contrary to that which is established among us, and which is likely to keep possession, for a long time, of the minds of the people. And though it is much to be hoped, that the progress of reason will, by degrees, abate the acrimony of opposite religions all over Europe; yet the spirit of moderation has, as yet, made too slow advances to be entirely trusted.

Thus, upon the whole, the advantages of the settlement in the family of Stuart, which frees us from a disputed title, seem to bear some proportion with those of the settlement in the family of Hanover, which frees us from the claims of prerogative; but, at the same time, its disadvantages, by placing on the throne a Roman Catholic, are greater than those of the other establishment, in settling the crown on a foreign prince. What party an impartial patriot, in the reign of king William or queen Anne, would have chosen amidst these opposite views, may perhaps to some appear hard to determine.

But the settlement in the house of Hanover has actually taken place. The princes of that family, without intrigue, without cabal, without solicitation on their part, have been called to mount our throne, by the united voice of the whole legislative body. They have, since their accession, displayed, in all their actions, the utmost mildness, equity, and regard to the laws and constitution. Our own ministers, our own parliaments, ourselves, have governed us; and if aught ill has befallen us, we can only blame fortune or ourselves. What a reproach must we become among nations, if, disgusted with a settlement so deliberately made, and whose conditions have been so religiously observed, we should throw every thing again into confusion; and by our levity and rebellious disposition, prove ourselves totally unfit for any state but that of absolute slavery and subjection?

The greatest inconvenience, attending a disputed title, is, that it brings us in danger of civil wars and rebellions. What wise man, to avoid this inconvenience, would run directly into a civil war and rebellion? Not to mention, that so long possession, secured by so many laws, must, ere this time, in the apprehension of a great part of the nation, have begotten a title in the house of Hanover, independent

of their present possession: so that now we should not, even by a revolution, obtain the end of avoiding a disputed title.

No revolution made by national forces, will ever be able, without some other great necessity, to abolish our debts and incumbrances, in which the interest of so many persons is concerned. And a revolution made by foreign forces, is a conquest: a calamity, with which the precarious balance of power threatens us, and which our civil dissensions are likely, above all other circumstances, to bring upon us.

XXXVIII.—IDEA OF A PERFECT COMMONWEALTH.

It is not with forms of government, as with other artificial contrivances, where an old engine may be rejected, if we can discover another more accurate and commodious, or where trials may safely be made, even though the success be doubtful. An established government has an infinite advantage, by that very circumstance of its being established, the bulk of mankind being governed by authority, not reason, and never attributing authority to any thing that has not the recommendation of antiquity.

To tamper, therefore, in this affair, or try experiments merely upon the credit of supposed argument and philosophy, can never be the part of a wise magistrate, who will bear a reverence to what carries the marks of age; and though he may attempt some improvements for the public good, yet will he adjust his innovations, as much as possible, to the ancient fabric, and preserve entire the chief pillars and supports of the constitution.

The mathematicians in Europe have been much divided concerning that figure of a ship which is the most commodious for sailing; and Huygens, who at last determined the controversy, is justly thought to have obliged the learned as well as commercial world; though Columbus had sailed to America, and sir Francis Drake made the tour of the world, without any such discovery. As one form of government must be allowed more perfect than another, independent of the manners and humours of particular men; why may we not inquire what is the most perfect of all, though the common botched and inaccurate governments seem to serve the purposes of society, and though it be not so easy to establish a new system of government, as to build a vessel upon a new construction? The subject is surely the most worthy of curiosity of any the wit of man can possibly devise. And who knows, if this controversy were fixed by the universal consent of the wise and learned, but, in some future age, an opportunity

might be afforded of reducing the theory to practice, either by a dissolution of some old government, or by the combination of men to form a new one, in some distant part of the world? In all cases, it must be advantageous to know what is the most perfect in the kind, that we may be able to bring any real constitution or form of government as near it as possible, by such gentle alterations and innovations as may not give too great disturbance to society

All I pretend to in the present essay is, to revive this subject of speculation, and therefore I shall deliver my sentiments in as few words as possible A long dissertation on that head would not, I apprehend, be very acceptable to the public, who will be apt to regard such disquisitions both as useless and chimerical.

All plans of government, which suppose great reformation in the manners of mankind, are plainly imaginary. Of this nature, are the *Republic* of Plato, and the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More. The *Oceana* is the only valuable model of a commonwealth that has yet been offered to the public

The chief defects of the *Oceana* seem to be these. I Its rotation is inconvenient, by throwing men, of whatever abilities, by intervals, out of public employment II Its *Agrarian* is impracticable. Men will soon learn the art, which was practised in ancient Rome, of concealing their possessions under other people's names, till at last, the abuse will become so common that they will throw off even the appearance of restraint. III The *Oceana* provides not a sufficient security for liberty, or the redress of grievances The senate must propose, and the people consent, by which means, the senate have not only a negative upon the people, but, what is of much greater consequence, their negative goes before the votes of the people Were the king's negative of the same nature in the English constitution, and could he prevent any bill from coming into parliament, he would be an absolute monarch. As his negative follows the votes of the houses, it is of little consequence such a difference is there in the manner of placing the same thing. When a popular bill has been debated in parliament, is brought to maturity, all its conveniences and inconveniences weighed and balanced, if afterwards it be presented for the royal assent, few princes will venture to reject the unanimous desire of the people. But could the king crush a disagreeable bill in embryo (as was the case for some time in the Scottish parliament, by means of the lords of the articles), the British government would have no balance, nor would grievances ever be redressed. and it is certain, that exorbitant power proceeds not in any government from new laws, so much as from neglecting to remedy the abuses which frequently rise from the old ones. A government, says Machiavel, must often be brought back to its original principles. It appears then that, in the Oceana, the whole legislature may be said to rest in the senate; which

Harrington would own to be an inconvenient form of government, especially after the *Agrarian* is abolished.

Here is a form of government, to which I cannot, in theory, discover any considerable objection

Let Great Britain and Ireland, or any territory of equal extent, be divided into 100 counties, and each country into 100 parishes, making in all 10,000. If the county proposed to be erected into a commonwealth, be of more narrow extent, we may diminish the number of counties, but never bring them below thirty If it be of greater extent, it were better to enlarge the parishes, or throw more parishes into a county, than increase the number of counties.

Let all the freeholders of twenty pounds a-year in the county, and all the householders worth five hundred pounds in the town parishes, meet annually in the parish church, and chuse, by ballot, some freeholder of the county for their member, whom we shall call the *county representative*

Let the 100 county representatives, two days after their election, meet in the county town, and chuse by ballot, from their own body, ten county *magistrates*, and one senator There are, therefore, in the whole commonwealth, 100 senators, 1100 county magistrates, and 10,000 county representatives For we shall bestow on all senators the authority of county magistrates, and on all county magistrates, the authority of county representatives.

Let the senators meet in the capital, and be endowed with the whole executive power of the commonwealth the power of peace and war, of giving orders to generals, admirals, and ambassadors, and, in short, all the prerogatives of a British king, except his negative

Let the county representatives meet in their particular counties, and possess the whole legislative power of the commonwealth, the greater number of counties deciding the question, and where these are equal, let the senate have the casting vote

Every new law must first be debated in the senate, and though rejected by it, if ten senators insist and protest, it must be sent down to the counties. The senate, if they please, may join to the copy of the law their reasons for receiving or rejecting it.

Because it would be troublesome to assemble all the county representatives for every trivial law, that may be requisite, the senate have their choice of sending down the law either to the county magistrates or county representatives

The magistrates, though the law be referred to them, may, if they please, call the representatives, and submit the affair to their determination.

Whether the law be referred by the senate to the county magistrates or representatives, a copy of it, and of the senate's reasons, must be

sent to every representative eight days before the day appointed for the assembling, in order to deliberate concerning it. And though the determination be, by the senate, referred to the magistrates, if five representatives of the county order the magistrates to assemble the whole court of representatives, and submit the affair to their determination, they must obey

Either the county magistrates or representatives may give, to the senator of the county, the copy of a law to be proposed to the senate, and if five counties concur in the same order, the law, though refused by the senate, must come either to the county magistrates or representatives, as is contained in the order of the five counties.

Any twenty counties, by a vote either of their magistrates or representatives, may throw any man out of all public offices for a year. Thirty counties for three years

The senate has a power of throwing out any member or number of members of its own body, not to be re-elected for that year The senate cannot throw out twice in a year the senator of the same county

The power of the old senate continues for three weeks after the annual election of the county representatives. Then all the new senators are shut up in a conclave, like the cardinals, and by an intricate ballot, such as that of Venice or Malta, they chuse the following magistrates, a protector, who represents the dignity of the commonwealth, and presides in the senate, two secretaries of state these six councils, a council of state, a council of religion and learning, a council of trade, a council of laws, a council of war, a council of the admiralty, each council consisting of five persons, together with six commissioners of the treasury and a first commissioner All these must be senators. The senate also names all the ambassadors to foreign courts, who may either be senators or not

The senate may continue any or all of these, but must re-elect them every year.

The protector and two secretaries have session and suffrage in the council of state. The business of that council is all foreign politics. The council of state has session and suffrage in all the other councils.

The council of religion and learning inspects the universities and clergy. That of trades inspects every thing that may effect commerce. That of laws inspects all the abuses of law by the inferior magistrates, and examines what improvements may be made by the municipal law. That of war inspects the militia and its discipline, magazines, stores, &c. and when the republic is in war, examines into the proper orders for generals. The council of admiralty, has the same power with regard to the navy, together with the nomination of the [illegible] and [illegible] officers.

None of these councils can give orders themselves, except where they receive such powers from the senate. In other cases, they must communicate every thing to the senate.

When the senate is under adjournment, any of the councils may assemble it before the day appointed for its meeting.

Besides these councils or courts, there is another called the court of *competitors;* which is thus constituted If any candidates for the office of senator have more votes than a third of the representatives, that candidate who has most votes, next to the senator elected, becomes incapable for one year of all public offices, even of being a magistrate or representative but he takes his seat in the court of competitors. Here then is a court which may sometimes consist of a hundred members, sometimes have no members at all, and by that means be for a year abolished

The court of competitors has no power in the commonwealth. It has only the inspection of public accounts, and the accusing of any man before the senate If the senate acquit him, the court of competitors may, if they please, appeal to the people, either magistrates or representatives Upon that appeal, the magistrates or representatives meet on the day appointed by the court of competitors, and chuse in each county three persons, from which number every senator is excluded These, to the number of 300, meet in the capital, and bring the person accused to a new trial

The court of competitors may propose any law to the senate, and if refused, may appeal to the people, that is, to the magistrates or representatives, who examine it in their counties Every senator, who is thrown out of the senate by a vote of the court, takes his seat in the court of competitors

The senate possesses all the judicative authority of the House of Lords, that is, all the appeals from the inferior courts. It likewise appoints the Lord Chancellor and all the officers of the law

Every county is a kind of republic within itself, and the representatives may make bye-laws, which have no authority till three months after they are voted. A copy of the law is sent to the senate, and to every other county The senate, or any single county, may, at any time, annul any bye-law of another county

The representatives have all the authority of the British justices of peace in trials, commitments, &c.

The magistrates have the appointment of all the officers of the revenue in each county All causes with regard to the revenue are carried ultimately by appeal before the magistrates. They pass the accompts of all the officers, but must have their own accompts examined and passed at the end of the year by the representatives.

The magistrates name rectors or ministers to all the parishes.

The Presbyterian government is established; and [illegible]

ecclesiastical court is an assembly or synod of all the presbyters of the county. The magistrates may take any cause from this court, and determine it themselves.

The magistrates may try, and depose or suspend any presbyter.

The militia is established in imitation of that of Switzerland, which being well known, we shall not insist upon it. It will only be proper to make this addition, that an army of 20,000 men be annually drawn out by rotation, paid and encamped during six weeks in summer, that the duty of a camp may not be altogether unknown.

The magistrates appoint all the colonels and downwards. The senate all upwards. During war, the general appoints the colonel and downwards, and his commission is good for a twelvemonth. But after that it must be confirmed by the magistrates of the county, to which the regiment belongs. The magistrates may break any officer in the county regiment. And the senate may do the same to any officer in the service. If the magistrates do not think proper to confirm the general's choice, they may appoint another officer in the place of him whom they reject.

All crimes are tried within the county by the magistrates and a jury. But the senate can stop any trial, and bring it before themselves.

Any county may indict any man before the senate for any crime.

The protector, the two secretaries, the council of state, with any five or more that the senate appoints, are possessed, on extraordinary emergencies, of *dictatorial* power for six months.

The protector may pardon any person condemned by the inferior courts.

In time of war, no officer of the army that is in the field can have any civil office in the commonwealth.

The capital, which we shall call London, may be allowed four members in the senate. It may therefore be divided into four counties. The representatives of each of these chuse one senator, and ten magistrates. There are therefore in the city four senators, forty-four magistrates, and four hundred representatives. The magistrates have the same authority as in the counties. The representatives also have the same authority, but they never meet in one general court: they give their votes in their particular county, or division of hundreds.

When they enact any bye-law, the greater number of counties or divisions determines the matter. And where these are equal, the magistrates have the casting vote.

The magistrates chuse the mayor, sheriff, recorder, and other officers of the city.

In the commonwealth, no representative, magistrate, or senator, as such, has any salary. The protector, secretaries, councils, and ambassadors, have salaries.

The first year in every century is set apart for correcting all

equalities, which time may have produced in the representative. This must be done by the legislature

The following political aphorisms may explain the reason of these orders.

The lower sort of people and small proprietors are good enough judges of one not very distant from them in rank or habitation; and therefore, in their parochial meetings, will probably chuse the best, or nearly the best representative but they are wholly unfit for county-meetings, and for electing into the higher offices of the republic. Their ignorance gives the grandees an opportunity of deceiving them.

Ten thousand, even though they were not annually elected, are a basis large enough for any free government. It is true, the nobles in Poland are more than 10,000, and yet these oppress the people. But as power always continues there in the same persons and families, this makes them, in a manner, a different nation from the people. Besides the nobles are there united under a few heads of families.

All free governments must consist of two councils, a lesser and greater, or, in other words, of a senate and people The people, as Harrington observes, would want wisdom, without the senate the senate, without the people, would want honesty

A large assembly of 1,000, for instance, to represent the people, if allowed to debate, would fall into disorder If not allowed to debate, the senate has a negative upon them, and the worst kind of negative, that before resolution

Here therefore is an inconvenience, which no government has yet fully remedied, but which is the easiest to be remedied in the world. If the people debate, all is confusion if they do not debate, they can only resolve, and then the senate carves for them Divide the people into many separate bodies, and then they may debate with safety, and every inconvenience seems to be prevented

Cardinal de Retz says, that all numerous assemblies, however composed, are mere mob, and swayed in their debates by the least motive. This we find confirmed by daily experience When an absurdity strikes a member, he conveys it to his neighbour, and so on, till the whole be infected Separate this great body; and though every member be only of middling sense, it is not probable, that anything but reason can prevail over the whole Influence and example being removed, good sense will always get the better of bad among a number of people.

There are two things to be guarded against in every *senate*: its combination, and its division. Its combination is most dangerous. And against this inconvenience we have provided the following remedies I. The great dependence of the senators on the people by annual elections; and that not by an undistinguished rabble, like the English electors, but by men of fortune and education. II. The small

power they are allowed. They have few offices to dispose of. Almost all are given by the magistrates in the counties. III The court of competitors, which being composed of men that are their rivals, next to them in interest, and uneasy in their present situation, will be sure to take all advantages against them.

The division of the senate is prevented, I By the smallness of their number II As faction supposes a combination in a separate interest, it is prevented by their dependence on the people III They have a power of expelling any factious member It is true, when another member of the same spirit comes from the county they have no power of expelling him, nor is it fit they should, for that shows the humour to be in the people, and may possibly arise from some ill conduct in public affairs. IV Almost any man, in a senate so regularly chosen by the people, may be supposed fit for any civil office It would be proper, therefore, for the senate to form some general resolutions with regard to the disposing of offices among the members which resolution would not confine them in critical times, when extraordinary parts on the one hand, or extraordinary stupidity on the other, appears in any senator but they would be sufficient to prevent intrigue and faction, by making the disposal of the offices a thing of course For instance, let it be a resolution, that no man shall enjoy any office till he has sat four years in the senate that, except ambassadors, no man shall be in office two years following that no man shall attain the higher offices but through the lower that no man shall be protector twice, &c The senate of Venice govern themselves by such resolutions

In foreign politics the interest of the senate can scarcely ever be divided from that of the people and therefore it is fit to make the senate absolute with regard to them, otherwise there could be no secrecy or refined policy Besides, without money no alliance can be executed, and the senate is still sufficiently dependent. Not to mention, that the legislative power, being always superior to the executive, the magistrates or representatives may interpose whenever they think proper

The chief support of the British government is the opposition of interests but that, though in the main serviceable, breeds endless factions. In the foregoing plan, it does all the good without any of the harm. The *competitors* have no power of controlling the senate: they have only the power of accusing, and appealing to the people.

It is necessary, likewise, to prevent both combination and division in the thousand magistrates. This is done sufficiently by the separation of places and interests.

But lest that should not be sufficient, their dependence on the 10,000 for their elections serves to the same purpose.

Nor is that all: for the 10,000 may resume the power whenever

they

they please; and not only when they all please, but when any five of a hundred please, which will happen upon the very first suspicion of a separate interest.

The 10,000 are too large a body either to unite or divide, except when they meet in one place, and fall under the guidance of ambitious leaders. Not to mention their annual election, by the whole body of the people, that are of any consideration.

A small commonwealth is the happiest government in the world within itself, because every thing lies under the eye of the rulers: but it may be subdued by great force from without. This scheme seems to have all the advantages both of a great and a little commonwealth.

Every county-law may be annulled either by the senate or another county, because that shows an opposition of interest: in which case no part ought to decide for itself. The matter must be referred to the whole, which will best determine what agrees with general interest.

As to the clergy and militia, the reason of these orders are obvious. Without the dependence of the clergy on the civil magistrates, and without a militia, it is in vain to think that any free government will ever have security or stability.

In many governments, the inferior magistrates have no rewards but what arise from their ambition, vanity, or public spirit. The salaries of the French judges amount not to the interest of the sums they pay for their offices. The Dutch burgo-masters have little more immediate profit than the English justices of peace, or the members of the house of commons formerly. But lest any should suspect that this would beget negligence in the administration (which is little to be feared, considering the natural ambition of mankind), let the magistrates have competent salaries. The senators have access to so many honourable and lucrative offices, that their attendance needs not be bought. There is little attendance required of the representatives.

That the foregoing plan of government is practicable, no one can doubt who considers the resemblance that it bears to the commonwealth of the United Provinces, a wise and renowned government. The alterations in the present scheme seem all evidently for the better. I. The representation is more equal. II. The unlimited power of the burgo-masters in the towns, which forms a perfect aristocracy in the Dutch commonwealth, is corrected by a well-tempered democracy, in giving to the people the annual election of the country representatives. III. The negative, which every province and town has upon the whole body of the Dutch republic, with regard to alliances, peace, and war, and the imposition of taxes, is here removed. IV. The counties, in the present plan, are not so independent of each other, nor do they form separate bodies so much as the seven provinces; where the jealousy and envy of the smaller provinces and towns against the greater, particularly Holland and Amsterdam, have

frequently disturbed the government. V. Larger powers, though of the safest kind, are intrusted to the senate than the States-General possess; by which means, the former may become more expeditious and secret in their resolutions than it is possible for the latter.

The chief alterations that could be made on the British government, in order to bring it to the most perfect model of limited monarchy, seem to be the following. I. The plan of Cromwell's parliament ought to be restored, by making the representation equal, and by allowing none to vote in the county elections who possess not a property of 200 pounds value. II. As such a house of commons would be too weighty for a frail house of lords, like the present, the Bishops and Scotch Peers, ought to be removed: the number of the upper house ought to be raised to three or four hundred: their seats not hereditary, but during life: they ought to have the election of their own members; and no commoner should be allowed to refuse a seat that was offered him. By this means the house of lords would consist entirely of the men of chief credit, abilities, and interest in the nation; and every turbulent leader in the house of commons might be taken off, and connected by interest with the house of peers. Such an aristocracy would be an excellent barrier both to the monarchy and against it. At present, the balance of our government depends in some measure on the abilities and the behaviour of the sovereign; which are variable and uncertain circumstances.

This plan of limited monarchy, however corrected, seems still liable to three great inconveniences. I. It removes not entirely, though it may soften, the parties of *court* and *country*. II. The king's personal character must still have great influence on the government. III. The sword is in the hands of a single person, who will always neglect to discipline the militia, in order to have a pretence for keeping up a standing army.

We shall conclude this subject, with observing the falsehood of the common opinion, that no large state, such as France or Great Britain, could ever be modelled into a commonwealth, but that such a form of government can only take place in a city or small territory. The contrary seems probable. Though it is more difficult to form a republican government in an extensive country than in a city; there is more facility, when once it is formed, of preserving it steady and uniform, without tumult and faction. It is not easy for the distant parts of a large state to combine in any plan of free government; but they easily conspire in the esteem and reverence for a single person, who, by means of this popular favour, may seize the power, and forcing the more obstinate to submit, may establish a monarchical government. On the other hand, a city readily concurs in the same notions of government, the natural equality of property favours liberty,

and the nearness of habitation enables the citizens mutually to assist each other Even under absolute princes, the subordinate government of cities is commonly republican, while that of counties and provinces is monarchical But these same circumstances, which facilitate the erection of commonwealths in cities, render their constitution more frail and uncertain Democracies are turbulent. For however the people may be separated or divided into small parties, either in their votes or elections, their near habitation in a city will always make the force of popular tides and currents very sensible. Aristocracies are better adapted for peace and order, and accordingly were most admired by ancient writers, but they are jealous and oppressive. In a large government, which is modelled with masterly skill, there is compass and room enough to refine the democracy, from the lower people who may be admitted into the first elections or first concoction of the commonwealth, to the higher magistrates, who direct all the movements At the same time, the parts are so distant and remote, that it is very difficult, either by intrigue, prejudice, or passion, to hurry them into any measures against the public interest.

It is needless to inquire, whether such a government would be immortal. I allow the justness of the poet's exclamation on the endless projects of human race, *Man and for ever?* The world itself probably is not immortal. Such consuming plagues may arise as would leave even a perfect government a weak prey to its neighbours. We know not to what length enthusiasm, or other extraordinary movements of the human mind, may transport men, to the neglect of all order and public good Where difference of interest is removed, whimsical and unaccountable factions often arise, from personal favour or enmity Perhaps rust may grow to the springs of the most accurate political machine, and disorder its motions Lastly, extensive conquests, when pursued, must be the ruin of every free government, and of the more perfect governments sooner than of the imperfect because of the very advantages which the former possess above the latter And though such a state ought to establish a fundamental law against conquests, yet republics have ambition as well as individuals, and present interest make men forgetful of their posterity. It is a sufficient incitement to human endeavours that such a government would flourish for many ages, without pretending to bestow, on any work of man, that immortality which the Almighty seems to have refused to his own productions.

ESSAY XXXIX.—AN INQUIRY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

SECTION I.—OF THE DIFFERENT SPECIES OF PHILOSOPHY

MORAL philosophy, or the science of human nature, may be treated after two different manners, each of which has its peculiar merit, and may contribute to the entertainment, instruction, and reformation of mankind. The one considers man chiefly as born for action, and as influenced in his measures by taste and sentiment pursuing one object, and avoiding another, according to the value which these objects seem to possess, according to the light in which they present themselves. As virtue, of all objects, is allowed to be the most valuable, this species of philosophers paint her in the most amiable colours, borrowing all helps from poetry and eloquence, and treating their subject in an easy and obvious manner, and such as is best fitted to please the imagination, and engage the affections. They select the most striking observations and instances from common life, place opposite characters in a proper contrast, and alluring us into the paths of virtue by the views of glory and happiness, direct our steps in these paths by the soundest precepts and most illustrious examples. They make us feel the difference between vice and virtue, they excite and regulate our sentiments, and so they can but bend our hearts to the love of probity and true honour, they think that they have fully attained the end of all their labours.

The other species of philosophers consider man in the light of a reasonable rather than an active being, and endeavour to form his understanding more than cultivate his manners. They regard human nature as a subject of speculation, and with a narrow scrutiny examine it, in order to find those principles which regulate our understanding, excite our sentiments, and make us approve or blame any particular object, action, or behaviour. They think it a reproach to all literature, that philosophy should not yet have fixed, beyond controversy, the foundation of morals, reasoning, and criticism, and should for ever talk of truth and falsehood, vice and virtue, beauty and deformity, without being able to determine the source of those distinctions. While they attempt this arduous task, they are deterred by no difficulties, but proceeding from particular instances to general principles, they still push on their inquiries to principles more general, and rest not satisfied till they arrive at those original principles, by which, in every science, all human curiosity must be bounded. Though their speculations seem abstract, and even unintelligible to common readers, they aim at the approbation of the learned and wise; and think themselves sufficiently compensated for the labour of their whole lives, if

they can discover some hidden truths, which may contribute to t
instruction of posterity.

It is certain that the easy and obvious philosophy will always, wi
the generality of mankind, have the preference above the accurate an
abstruse, and by many will be recommended, not only as mo
agreeable, but more useful, than the other. It enters more in
common life, moulds the heart and affections, and, by touchi
those principles which actuate men, reforms their conduct, and brin
them nearer to that model of perfection which it describes. On t
contrary, the abstruse philosophy, being founded on a turn of min
which cannot enter into business and action, vanishes when the ph
losopher leaves the shade and comes into open day, nor can
principles easily retain any influence over our conduct and behavio
The feelings of our heart, the agitation of our passions, the vehemen
of our affections, dissipate all its conclusions, and reduce the pr
found philosopher to a mere plebeian.

This also must be confessed, that the most durable as well as juste
fame, has been acquired by the easy philosophy and that abstra
reasoners seem hitherto to have enjoyed only a momentary reputatio
from the caprice or ignorance of their own age, but have not been ab
to support their renown with more equitable posterity It is easy f
a profound philosopher to commit a mistake in his subtile reasoning
and one mistake is the necessary parent of another, while he push
on his consequences, and is not deterred from embracing any co
clusion, by its unusual appearance, or its contradiction to popul
opinion But a philosopher, who purposes only to represent the comm
sense of mankind in more beautiful and more engaging colours, if
accident he falls into error, goes no farther, but renewing his appe
to common sense, and the natural sentiments of the mind, returns in
the right path, and secures himself from any dangerous illusion
The fame of Cicero flourishes at present but that of Aristotle
utterly decayed. La Bruyere passes the seas, and still maintains h
reputation, but the glory of Malebranche is confined to his own natio
and to his own age And Addison, perhaps, will be read with ple
sure, when Locke shall be entirely forgotten

The mere philosopher is a character which is commonly but lit
acceptable in the world, as being supposed to contribute nothi
either to the advantage or pleasure of society while he lives remo
from communication with mankind, and is wrapped up in principl
and notions equally remote from their comprehension. On the oth
hand, the mere ignorant is still more despised; nor is any thi
deemed a surer sign of an illiberal genius, in an age and nation wh
the sciences flourish, than to be entirely destitute of all relish for the
noble entertainments. The most perfect character is supposed to l
between those extremes; retaining an equal ability and taste

books, company, and business; preserving in conversation that discernment and delicacy which arise from polite letters, and, in business, that probity and accuracy which are the natural result of a just philosophy. In order to diffuse and cultivate so accomplished a character, nothing can be more useful than compositions of the easy style and manner, which draw not too much from life, require no deep application or retreat to be comprehended, and send back the student among mankind full of noble sentiments and wise precepts, applicable to every exigence of human life. By means of such compositions virtue becomes amiable, science agreeable, company instructive, and retirement entertaining.

Man is a reasonable being, and, as such, receives from science his proper food and nourishment: but so narrow are the bounds of human understanding, that little satisfaction can be hoped for in this particular, either from the extent or security of his acquisitions. Man is a sociable, no less than a reasonable being: but neither can he always enjoy company agreeable and amusing, or preserve the proper relish for them. Man is also an active being; and, from that disposition, as well as from the various necessities of human life, must submit to business and occupation: but the mind requires some relaxation, and cannot always support its bent to care and industry. It seems, then, that nature has pointed out a mixed kind of life as most suitable to the human race, and secretly admonished them to allow none of these biases to *draw* too much, so as to incapacitate them for other occupations and entertainments. Indulge your passion for science, says she, but let your science be human, and such as may have a direct reference to action and society. Abstruse thought and profound researches I prohibit, and will severely punish, by the pensive melancholy which they introduce, by the endless uncertainty in which they involve you, and by the cold reception your pretended discoveries shall meet with, when communicated. Be a philosopher; but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man.

Were the generality of mankind contented to prefer the easy philosophy to the abstract and profound, without throwing any blame or contempt on the latter, it might not be improper, perhaps, to comply with this general opinion, and allow every man to enjoy, without opposition, his own taste and sentiment. But as the matter is often carried farther, even to the absolute rejecting of all profound reasonings, or what is commonly called *metaphysics*, we shall now proceed to consider what can reasonably be pleaded in their behalf.

We may begin with observing, that one considerable advantage which results from the accurate and abstract philosophy, is its subserviency to the easy and humane; which, without the former, can never attain a sufficient degree of exactness in its sentiments, precepts, or reasonings. All polite letters are nothing but pictures of human

life in various attitudes and situations; and inspire us with different sentiments of praise or blame, admiration, or ridicule, according to the qualities of the object which they set before us. An artist must be better qualified to succeed in this undertaking, who besides a delicate taste and a quick apprehension, possesses an accurate knowledge of the internal fabric, the operations of the understanding, the workings of the passions, and the various species of sentiment which discriminate vice and virtue. How painful soever this inward search or inquiry may appear, it becomes in some measure requisite to those who would describe with success the obvious and outward appearances of life and manners. The anatomist presents to the eye the most hideous and disagreeable objects, but his science is useful to the painter in delineating even a Venus or an Helen. While the latter employs all the richest colours of his art, and gives his figures the most graceful and engaging airs, he must still carry his attention to the inward structure of the human body, the position of the muscles, the fabric of the bones, and the use and figure of every part or organ. Accuracy is, in every case, advantageous to beauty, and just reasoning to delicate sentiment. In vain would we exalt the one by depreciating the other.

Besides, we may observe, in every art or profession, even those which most concern life or action, that a spirit of accuracy, however acquired, carries all of them nearer their perfection, and renders them more subservient to the interests of society. And though a philosopher may live remote from business, the genius of philosophy, if carefully cultivated by several, must gradually diffuse itself throughout the whole society, and bestow a similar correctness on every art or calling. The politician will acquire greater foresight and subtilty, in the subdividing and balancing of power, the lawyer more method and finer principles in his reasonings, and the general more regularity in his discipline, and more caution in his plans and operations. The stability of modern governments above the ancient, and the accuracy of modern philosophy, have improved, and probably will still improve, by similar gradations.

Were there no advantage to be reaped from these studies beyond the gratification of an innocent curiosity, yet ought not even this to be despised, as being an accession to those few safe and harmless pleasures which are bestowed on the human race. The sweetest and most inoffensive path of life leads through the avenues of science and learning, and whoever can either remove any obstructions in this way, or open up any new prospect, ought so far to be esteemed a benefactor to mankind. And though these researches may appear painful and fatiguing, it is with some minds as with some bodies, which being endowed with vigorous and florid health, require severe exercise, and reap a pleasure from what, to the generality of mankind,

may seem burdensome and laborious. Obscurity, indeed, is painful to the mind as well as to the eye, but, to bring light from obscurity, by whatever labour, must needs be delightful and rejoicing

But this obscurity, in the profound and abstract philosophy, is objected to, not only as painful and fatiguing, but as the inevitable source of uncertainty and error Here, indeed, lies the most just and most plausible objection against a considerable part of metaphysics, that they are not properly a science, but arise, either from the fruitless efforts of human vanity, which would penetrate into subjects utterly inaccessible to the understanding, or from the craft of popular superstitions, which, being unable to defend themselves on fair ground, raise these entangling brambles to cover and protect their weakness. Chased from the open country, these robbers fly into the forest, and lie in wait to break in upon every unguarded avenue of the mind, and overwhelm it with religious fears and prejudices. The stoutest antagonist, if he remit his watch a moment, is oppressed And many, through cowardice and folly, open the gates to the enemies, and willingly receive them with reverence and submission, as their legal sovereigns

But this is a sufficient reason why philosophers should desist from such researches, and leave superstition still in possession of her retreat? Is it not proper to draw an opposite conclusion, and perceive the necessity of carrying the war into the most secret recesses of the enemy? In vain do we hope, that men, from frequent disappointment, will at last abandon such airy sciences, and discover the proper province of human reason For, besides that many persons find too sensible an interest in perpetually recalling such topics, besides this, I say, the motive of blind despair can never reasonably have place in the sciences, since, however unsuccessful former attempts may have proved, there is still room to hope, that industry, good fortune, or improved sagacity of succeeding generations, may reach discoveries unknown to former ages. Each adventurous genius will still leap at the arduous prize, and find himself stimulated, rather than discouraged, by the failures of his predecessors, while he hopes that the glory of achieving so hard an adventure is reserved for him alone The only method of freeing learning, at once, from these abstruse questions, is to inquire seriously into the nature of the human understanding, and show, from an exact analysis of its powers, and capacity that it is by no means fitted for such remote and abstruse subjects. We must submit to this fatigue, in order to live at ease ever after. and must cultivate true metaphysics with some care, in order to destroy the false and adulterate. Indolence, which, to some persons, affords a safeguard against this deceitful philosophy, is, with others, overbalanced by curiosity; and despair, which, at some moments, prevails, may give place afterwards to sanguine hopes and expectations. Accurate and

just reasoning is the only catholic remedy, fitted for all persons and all dispositions, and is alone able to subvert that abstruse philosophy and metaphysical jargon, which, being mixed up with popular superstition, renders it in a manner impenetrable to careless reasoners, and gives it the air of science and wisdom.

Besides this advantage of rejecting, after deliberate inquiry, the most uncertain and disagreeable part of learning, there are many positive advantages, which result from an accurate scrutiny into the powers and faculties of human nature. It is remarkable, concerning the operations of the mind, that though most intimately present to us, yet, whenever they become the object of reflection, they seem involved in obscurity; nor can the eye readily find those lines and boundaries which discriminate and distinguish them. The objects are too fine to remain long in the same aspect or situation; and must be apprehended in an instant, by a superior penetration, derived from nature, and improved by habit and reflection. It becomes, therefore, no inconsiderable part of science, barely to know the different operations of the mind, to separate them from each other, to class them under their proper heads, and to correct all that seeming disorder, in which they lie involved, when made the object of reflection and inquiry. This task of ordering and distinguishing, which has no merit, when performed with regard to external bodies, the objects of our senses, rises in its value, when directed towards the operations of the mind, in proportion to the difficulty and labour which we meet with in performing it. And if we can go no farther than this mental geography, or delineation, of the distinct parts and powers of the mind, it is at least a satisfaction to go so far; and the more obvious this science may appear (and it is by no means obvious), the more contemptible still must the ignorance of it be esteemed, in all pretenders to learning and philosophy.

Nor can there remain any suspicion, that this science is uncertain and chimerical; unless we should entertain such a scepticism as is entirely subversive of all speculation, and even action. It cannot be doubted that the mind is endowed with several powers and faculties, that these powers are distinct from each other, that what is really distinct to the immediate perception may be distinguished by reflection; and consequently, that there is a truth and falsehood in all propositions on this subject, and a truth and falsehood, which lie not beyond the compass of human understanding. There are many obvious distinctions of this kind, such as those between the will and understanding, the imagination and passions, which fall within the comprehension of every human creature; and the finer and more philosophical distinctions are no less real and certain, though more difficult to be comprehended. Some instances, especially late ones, of success in these inquiries, may give us a juster notion of the certainty and solidity of [illegible] learning. And shall we esteem it worthy the labour of a [illegible]

to give us a true system of the planets, and adjust the position and order of those remote bodies, while we affect to overlook those who, with so much success, delineate the parts of the mind, in which we are so intimately concerned?

But may we not hope, that philosophy, if cultivated with care, and encouraged by the attention of the public, may carry its researches still farther, and discover, at least in some degree, the secret springs and principles by which the human mind is actuated in its operation? Astronomers had long contented themselves with proving, from the phaenomena, the true motions, order, and magnitude of the heavenly bodies till a philosopher, at last, arose, who seems, from the happiest reasoning, to have also determined the laws and forces, by which the revolutions of the planets are governed and directed. The like has been performed with regard to other parts of nature And there is no reason to despair of equal success in our inquiries concerning the mental powers and economy, if prosecuted with equal capacity and caution. It is probable, that one operation and principle of the mind depends on another which, again, may be resolved into one more general and universal and how far these researches may possibly be carried, it will be difficult for us, before, or even after, a careful trial, exactly to determine This is certain, that attempts of this kind are every day made even by those who philosophize the most negligently And nothing can be more requisite than to enter upon the enterprise with thorough care and attention, that, if it lie within the compass of human understanding, it may at last be happily achieved, if not, it may, however, be rejected with some confidence and security This last conclusion, surely, is not desirable, nor ought it to be embraced too rashly For how much must we diminish from the beauty and value of this species of philosophy, upon such a supposition? Moralists have hitherto been accustomed, when they considered the vast multitude and diversity of those actions that excite our approbation or dislike, to search for some common principle, on which this variety of sentiments might depend. And though they have sometimes carried the matter too far, by their passion for some one general principle, it must, however, be confessed, that they are excusable in expecting to find some general principles, into which all the vices and virtues were justly to be resolved. The like has been the endeavour of critics, logicians, and even politicans nor have their attempts been wholly unsuccessful, though perhaps longer time, greater accuracy, and more ardent application, may bring these sciences still nearer their perfection. To throw up at once all pretensions of this kind, may justly be deemed more rash, precipitate, and dogmatical, than even the boldest and most affirmative philosophy, that has ever attempted to impose its crude dictates and principles on mankind.

What though these reasonings concerning human nature seem abstract, and of difficult comprehension? This affords no presumption of their falsehood. On the contrary, it seems impossible, that what has hitherto escaped so many wise and profound philosophers, can be very obvious and easy And whatever pains these researches may cost us, we may think ourselves sufficiently rewarded, not only in point of profit but of pleasure, if, by that means, we can make any addition to our stock of knowledge, in subjects of such unspeakable importance

But as, after all, the abstractedness of these speculations is no recommendation, but rather a disadvantage to them, and as this difficulty may perhaps be surmounted by care and art, and the avoiding of all unnecessary detail, we have, in the following inquiry, attempted to throw some light upon subjects, from which uncertainty has hitherto deterred the wise, and obscurity the ignorant Happy, if we can unite the boundaries of the different species of philosophy, by reconciling profound inquiry with clearness, and truth with novelty!

SECTION II.—OF THE ORIGIN OF IDEAS.

EVERY one will readily allow, that there is a considerable difference between the perceptions of the mind, when a man feels the pain of excessive heat, or the pleasure of moderate warmth, and when he afterwards recals to his memory this sensation, or anticipates it by his imagination. These faculties may mimic or copy the perceptions of the senses, but they never can entirely reach the force and vivacity of the original sentiment The utmost we say of them, even when they operate with greatest vigour, is, that they represent their object in so lively a manner, that we could *almost* say we feel or see it, but, except the mind be disordered by disease or madness, they never can arrive at such a pitch of vivacity, as to render these perceptions altogether undistinguishable. All the colours of poetry, however splendid, can never paint natural objects in such a manner as to make the description be taken for a real landscape. The most lively thought is still inferior to the dullest sensation.

We may observe a like distinction to run through all the other perceptions of the mind. A man in a fit of anger is actuated in a very different manner from one who only thinks of that emotion. If you tell me, that any person is in love, I easily understand your meaning, and form a just conception of his situation; but never can mistake

that conception for the real disorders and agitations of the passion. When we reflect on our past sentiments and affections, our thought is a faithful mirror, and copies its objects truly; but the colours which it employs are faint and dull, in comparison of those in which our original perceptions were clothed. It requires no nice discernment or metaphysical head to mark the distinction between them.

Here, therefore, we may divide all the perceptions of the mind into two classes or species, which are distinguished by their different degrees of force and vivacity. The less forcible and lively are commonly denominated THOUGHTS or IDEAS. The other species want a name in our language, and in most others; I suppose, because it was not requisite for any but philosophical purposes, to rank them under a general term or appellation. Let us, therefore, use a little freedom, and call them IMPRESSIONS; employing that word in a sense somewhat different from the usual. By the term *impression*, then, I mean all our more lively perceptions, when we hear, or see, or feel, or love, or hate, or desire, or will. And impressions are distinguished from ideas, which are the less lively perceptions, of which we are concious, when we reflect on any of those sensations or movements above mentioned.

Nothing, at first view, may seem more unbounded than the thought of man; which not only escapes all human power and authority, but is not even restrained within the limits of nature and reality. To form monsters, and join incongruous shapes and appearances, costs the imagination no more trouble than to conceive the most natural and familiar objects. And while the body is confined to one planet, along which it creeps with pain and difficulty; the thought can in an instant transport us into the most distant regions of the universe; or even beyond the universe, into the unbounded chaos, where nature is supposed to lie in total confusion. What never was seen, or heard of, may yet be conceived; nor is any thing beyond the power of thought, except what implies an absolute contradiction.

But though our thought seems to possess this unbounded liberty, we shall find, upon a nearer examination, that it is really confined within very narrow limits, and that all this creative power of the mind amounts to no more than the faculty of compounding, transposing, augmenting, or diminishing the materials afforded us by the senses and experience. When we think of a golden mountain, we only join two consistent ideas, *gold* and *mountain*, with which we were formerly acquainted. A vicious horse we can conceive; because, from our own feeling, we can conceive virtue; and this we may unite to the figure and shape of a horse, which is an animal familiar to us. In short, all the materials of thinking are derived either from our outward or inward sentiment: the mixture and composition of these belongs alone

to the mind and will: or, to express myself in philosophical language, all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones.

To prove this, the two following arguments will, I hope, be sufficient. I. When we analyse our thoughts or ideas, however compounded or sublime, we always find that they resolve themselves into such simple ideas as were copied from a precedent feeling or sentiment. Even those ideas, which, at first view, seem the most wide of this origin, are found, upon a nearer scrutiny, to be derived from it. The idea of GOD, as meaning an infinitely intelligent, wise, and good Being, arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and augmenting, without limit, those qualities of goodness and wisdom. We may prosecute this inquiry to what length we please; where we shall always find, that every idea which we examine is copied from a similar impression. Those who would assert, that this position is not universally true, nor without exception, have only one, and that an easy, method of refuting it, by producing that idea, which, in their opinion, is not derived from this source. It will then be incumbent on us, if we would maintain our doctrine, to produce the impression or lively perception which corresponds to it.

II. If it happen from a defect of the organ, that a man is not susceptible of any species of sensation, we always find that he is as little susceptible of the correspondent ideas. A blind man can form no notion of colours; a deaf man of sounds. Restore either of them that sense in which he is deficient; by opening this new inlet for his sensations, you also open an inlet for the ideas; and he finds no difficulty in conceiving these objects. The case is the same, if the object proper for exciting any sensation has never been applied to the organ. A Laplander or Negro has no notion of the relish of wine. And though there are few or no instances of a like deficiency in the mind, where a person has never felt, or is wholly incapable of a sentiment or passion that belongs to his species, yet we find the same observation to take place in a less degree. A man of mild manners can form no idea of inveterate revenge or cruelty; nor can a selfish heart easily conceive the heights of friendship and generosity. It is readily allowed, that other beings may possess many senses of which we can have no conception; because the ideas of them have never been introduced to us, in the only manner by which an idea can have access to the mind, to wit, by the actual feeling and sensation.

There is, however, one contradictory phenomenon, which may prove, that it is not absolutely impossible for ideas to arise, independent of their correspondent impressions. I believe, it will readily be allowed, that the several distinct ideas of colour, which enter by the eye, or those of sound, which are conveyed by the ear, are really

different from each other; though, at the same time, resembling. Now if this be true of different colours, it must be no less so of the different shades of the same colour, and each shade produces a distinct idea, independent of the rest. For if this should be denied, it is possible, by the continual gradation of shades, to run a colour insensibly into what is most remote from it, and if you will not allow any of the means to be different, you cannot without absurdity, deny the extremes to be the same. Suppose, therefore, a person to have enjoyed his sight for thirty years, and to have become perfectly acquainted with colours of all kinds, except one particular shade of blue, for instance, which it never has been his fortune to meet with. Let all the different shades of that colour, except that single one, be placed before him, descending gradually from the deepest to the lightest, it is plain, that he will perceive a blank where that shade is wanting and will be sensible that there is a greater distance in that place between the contiguous colours than in any other. Now I ask, whether it be possible for him, from his own imagination, to supply this deficiency, and raise up to himself the idea of that particular shade, though it had never been conveyed to him by his senses? I believe there are few but will be of opinion that he can; and this may serve as a proof, that the simple ideas are not always, in every instance, derived from the correspondent impressions, though this instance is so singular, that it is scarcely worth our observing, and does not merit, that for it alone we should alter our general maxim.

Here, therefore, is a proposition, which not only seems, in itself, simple and intelligible, but, if a proper use were made of it, might render every dispute equally intelligible, and banish all that jargon which had so long taken possession of metaphysical reasonings, and drawn disgrace upon them. All ideas, especially abstract ones, are naturally faint and obscure: the mind has but a slender hold of them: they are apt to be confounded with other resembling ideas, and when we have often employed any term, though without a distinct meaning, we are apt to imagine it has a determinate idea annexed to it. On the contrary, all impressions, that is, all sensations either outward or inward, are strong and vivid: the limits between them are more exactly determined: nor is it easy to fall into any error or mistake with regard to them. When we entertain, therefore, any suspicion, that a philosophical term is employed without any meaning or idea (as is but too frequent), we need but inquire, *from what impression is that supposed idea derived?* And if it be impossible to assign any, this will serve to confirm our suspicion. By bringing ideas into so clear a light, we may reasonably hope to remove all dispute, which may arise concerning their nature and reality*.

* [illegible] by those, who [illegible]

SECTION III.—OF THE ASSOCIATION OF IDEAS.

It is evident, that there is a principle of connection between the different thoughts and ideas of the mind, and that, in their appearance to the memory or imagination, they introduce each other with a certain degree of method and regularity In our more serious thinking or discourse, this is so observable, that any particular thought, which breaks in upon the regular tract or chain of ideas, is immediately remarked and rejected And even in our wildest and most wandering reveries, nay, in our very dreams, we shall find, if we reflect, that the imagination ran not altogether at adventures, but that there was still a connection upheld among the different ideas which succeeded each other Were the loosest and freest conversation to be transcribed, there would immediately be observed something which connected it in all its transitions. Or where this is wanting, the person who broke the thread of discourse, might still inform you, that there had secretly revolved in his mind a succession of thought, which had gradually led him from the subject of conversation Among different languages, even where we cannot suspect the least connection or communication, it is found, that the words, expressive of ideas, the most compounded, do yet nearly correspond to each other a certain proof, that the simple ideas, comprehended in the compound ones, were bound together by some universal principle, which had an equal influence upon all mankind.

Though it be too obvious to escape observation, that different ideas are connected together, I do not find, that any philosopher has attempted to enumerate or class all the principles of association, a subject, however, that seems worthy of curiosity To me, there appear

ideas were copies of our impressions though it must be confessed that the terms which they employed were not chosen with such caution, nor so exactly defined, as to prevent all mistakes about their doctrine For what is meant by *innate?* If innate be equivalent to natural, then all the perceptions and ideas of the mind must be allowed to be innate or natural, in whatever sense we take the latter word, whether in opposition to what is uncommon, artificial or miraculous. If by innate be meant contemporary to our birth, the dispute seems to be frivolous nor is it worth while to inquire at what time thinking begins, whether before at, or after our birth Again, the word *idea* seems to be commonly taken in a very loose sense, by Locke and others as standing for any of our perceptions, our sensations and passions, as well as thoughts Now, in this sense, I should desire to know what can be meant by asserting, that self *love*, or resentment of injuries, or the passion between the sexes, is not innate?

But admitting these terms, *impressions* and *ideas*, in the sense above explained, and understanding by *innate* what is original or copied from no precedent perception, then may we assert, that all our impressions are innate, and our ideas not innate.

To be ingenuous, I must own it to be my opinion, that Locke was betrayed into this question by the schoolmen, who, making use of undefined terms, draw out their disputes to a tedious length, without ever touching the point in question. A like ambiguity and circumlocution seem to run through that philosopher's reasonings, on this as well as most other subjects.

to be only three principles of connection among ideas, namely, *Resemblance*, *Contiguity* in time or place, and *Cause* or *Effect*.

That these principles serve to connect ideas will not, I believe, be much doubted. A picture naturally leads our thoughts to the original [Resemblance], the mention of one apartment in a building naturally introduces an inquiry or discourse concerning the others [Contiguity]; and if we think of a wound, we can scarcely forbear reflecting on the pain which follows it [Cause and Effect]. But that this enumeration is complete, and that there are no other principles of association except these, may be difficult to prove to the satisfaction to the reader, or even to a man's own satisfaction. All we can do, in such cases, is to run over several instances, and examine carefully the principle which binds the different thoughts to each other, never stopping till we render the principle as general as possible.* The more instances we examine, and the more care we employ, the more assurance shall we acquire, that the enumeration, which we form from the whole, is complete and entire.

SECTION IV.—SCEPTICAL DOUBTS CONCERNING THE OPERATIONS OF THE UNDERSTANDING.

PART I.—All the objects of human reason or inquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, *Relations of Ideas*, and *Matters of Fact*. Of the first kind are the sciences of Geometry, Algebra, and Arithmetic, and in short every affirmation which is either intuitively or demonstratively certain. *That the square of the hypothenuse is equal to the square of the two sides*, is a proposition which expresses a relation between these figures. *That three times five is equal to the half of thirty*, expresses a relation between these numbers. Propositions of this kind are discoverable by the mere operation of thought, without dependence on what is any where existent in the universe. Though there never were a circle or triangle in nature, the truths demonstrated by Euclid would for ever retain their certainty and their evidence.

Matters of fact, which are the second objects of human reason, are not ascertained in the same manner; nor is our evidence of their truth, however great, of a like nature with the foregoing. The contrary of every matter of fact is still possible; because it can never imply a con-

* For instance, Contrast or Contrariety is also a connection among Ideas; but it may, perhaps, be considered as a mixture of *Causation* and *Resemblance*. Where two objects are contrary, the one destroys the other; that is, the cause of its annihilation, and the idea of the annihilation of an object implies the idea of its former existence.

tradiction, and is conceived by the mind with the same facility and distinctness, as if ever so conformable to reality. *That the sun will not rise to morrow*, is no less intelligible a proposition, and implies no more contradiction, than the affirmation, *that it will rise*. We should in vain, therefore, attempt to demonstrate its falsehood. Were it demonstratively false, it would imply a contradiction, and could never be distinctly conceived by the mind.

It may therefore be a subject worthy of curiosity, to inquire what is the nature of that evidence, which assures us of any real existence and matter of fact, beyond the present testimony of our senses, or the records of our memory. This part of philosophy, it is observable, had been little cultivated, either by the ancients or moderns; and therefore our doubts and errors, in the prosecution of so important an inquiry, may be the more excusable, while we march through such difficult paths without any guide or direction. They may even prove useful, by exciting curiosity, and destroying that implicit faith and security which is the bane of all reasoning and free inquiry. The discovery of defects in the common philosophy, if any such there be, will not, I presume, be a discouragement, but rather an incitement, as is usual, to attempt something more full and satisfactory than has yet been proposed to the public.

All reasonings concerning matter of fact seem to be founded on the relation of *Cause and Effect*. By means of that relation alone we can go beyond the evidence of our memory and senses. If you were to ask a man, why he believes any matter of fact which is absent; for instance, that his friend is in the country or in France; he would give you a reason; and this reason would be some other fact; as a letter received from him, or the knowledge of his former resolutions and promises. A man, finding a watch or any other machine in a desert island, would conclude that there had once been men in that island. All our reasonings concerning fact are of the same nature. And here it is constantly supposed, that there is a connection between the present fact and that which is inferred from it. Were there nothing to bind them together, the inference would be entirely precarious. The hearing of an articulate voice and rational discourse in the dark, assures us of the presence of some person: why? because these are the effects of the human make and fabric, and closely connected with it. If we anatomize all the other reasonings of this nature, we shall find, that they are founded on the relation of cause and effect, and that this relation is either near or remote, direct or collateral. Heat and light are collateral effects of fire, and the one effect may justly be inferred from the other.

If we would satisfy ourselves, therefore, concerning the nature of that evidence which assures us of matters of fact, we must inquire how we arrive at the knowledge of cause and effect.

I shall venture to affirm, as a general proposition which admits of no exception, that the knowledge of this relation is not, in any instance, attained by reasonings *a priori*, but arises entirely from experience, when we find, that any particular objects are constantly conjoined with each other. Let an object be presented to a man of ever so strong natural reason and abilities if that object be entirely new to him, he will not be able, by the most accurate examination of its sensible qualities, to discover any of its causes or effects. Adam, though his rational faculties be supposed, at the very first, entirely perfect, could not have inferred from the fluidity and transparency of water, that it would suffocate him, or from the light and warmth of fire, that it would consume him No object ever discovers, by the qualities which appear to the senses, either the causes which produced it, or the effects which will arise from it, nor can our reason, unassisted by experience, ever draw any inference concerning real existence and matter of fact.

This proposition, *that causes and effects are discoverable, not by reason, but by experience*, will readily be admitted with regard to such objects as we remember to have once been altogether unknown to us; since we must be conscious of the utter inability which we then lay under of fortelling what would arise from them. Present two smooth pieces of marble to a man who has no tincture of natural philosophy, he will never discover that they will adhere together in such a manner as to require great force to separate them in a direct line, while they make so small a resistance to a lateral pressure. Such events as bear little analogy to the common course of nature, are also readily confessed to be known only by experience, nor does any man imagine that the explosion of gunpowder, or the attraction of a loadstone, could ever be discovered by arguments *a priori* In like manner, when an effect is supposed to depend upon an intricate machinery or secret structure of parts, we make no difficulty in attributing all our knowledge of it to experience. Who will assert, that he can give the ultimate reason, why milk or bread is proper nourishment for a man, not for a lion or a tiger?

But the same truth may not appear at first sight to have the same evidence with regard to events, which have become familiar to us from our first appearance in the world, which bear a close analogy to the whole course of nature, and which are supposed to depend on the simple qualities of objects, without any secret structure of parts. We are apt to imagine, that we could discover these effects by the mere operation of our reason without experience. We fancy, that were we brought on a sudden into this world, we could at first have inferred, that one billiard-ball would communicate motion to another upon impulse; and that we needed not to have waited for the event, in order

to pronounce with certainty concerning it. Such is the influence of custom, that, where it is strongest, it not only covers our natural ignorance, but even conceals itself, and seems not to take place, merely because it is found in the highest degree

But to convince us, that all the laws of nature, and all the operations of bodies, without exception, are known only by experience, the following reflections may perhaps suffice Were any object presented to us, and were we required to pronounce concerning the effect which will result from it, without consulting past observation, after what manner, I beseech you, must the mind proceed in this operation? It must invent or imagine some event which it ascribes to the object as its effect, and it is plain that this invention must be entirely arbitrary The mind can never possibly find the effect in the supposed cause, by the most accurate scrutiny and examination For the effect is totally different from the cause, and consequently can never be discovered in it Motion in the second billiard-ball is a quite distinct event from motion in the first, nor is there anything in the one to suggest the smallest hint of the other A stone or piece of metal raised into the air, and left without any support, immediately falls but to consider the matter *a priori*, is there anything we discover in this situation which can beget the idea of a downward, rather than an upward, or any other motion, in the stone or metal?

And as the first imagination or invention of a particular effect, in all natural operations, is arbitrary, where we consult not experience, so must we also esteem the supposed tie or connection between the cause and effect which binds them together, and renders it impossible that any other effect could result from the operation of that cause When I see, for instance, a billiard-ball moving in a straight line towards another, even suppose motion in the second ball should by accident be suggested to me as the result of their contact or impulse, may I not conceive, that a hundred different events might as well follow from that cause? May not both these balls remain at absolute rest? May not the first ball return in a straight line, or leap off from the second in any line or direction? All these suppositions are consistent and conceivable Why then should we give the preference to one, which is no more consistent or conceivable than the rest? All our reasonings *a priori* will never be able to show us any foundation for this preference.

In a word, then, every effect is a distinct event from its cause. It could not therefore be discovered in the cause, and the first invention or conception of it, *a priori*, must be entirely arbitrary. And even after it is suggested, the conjunction of it with the cause must appear equally arbitrary; since there are always many other effects, which, to reason, must seem fully as consistent and natural. In vain, there-

fore, should we pretend to determine any single event, or infer any cause or effect, without the assistance of observation or experience.

Hence we may discover the reason, why no philosopher, who is rational and modest, has ever pretended to assign the ultimate cause of any natural operation, or to show distinctly the action of that power, which produces any single effect in the universe. It is confessed, that the utmost effort of human reason is, to reduce the principles productive of natural phenomena to a greater simplicity, and to resolve the many particular effects into a few general causes, by means of reasonings from analogy, experience, and observation. But as to the causes of these general causes, we should in vain attempt their discovery, nor shall we ever be able to satisfy ourselves by any particular explication of them. These ultimate springs and principles are totally shut up from human curiosity and enquiry. Elasticity, gravity, cohesion of parts, communication of motion by impulse, these are probably the ultimate causes and principles which we shall ever discover in nature, and we may esteem ourselves sufficiently happy, if, by accurate inquiry and reasoning, we can trace up the particular phenomena to, or near to, these general principles. The most perfect philosophy of the natural kind only staves off our ignorance a little longer as perhaps the most perfect philosophy of the moral or metaphysical kind serves only to discover larger portions of it. Thus the observation of human blindness and weakness is the result of all philosophy, and meets us, at every turn, in spite of our endeavours to elude or avoid it.

Nor is geometry, when taken into the assistance of natural philosophy, ever able to remedy this defect, or lead us into the knowledge of ultimate causes by all that accuracy of reasoning for which it is so justly celebrated. Every part of mixed mathematics proceeds upon the supposition, that certain laws are established by nature in her operations, and abstract reasonings are employed, either to assist experience in the discovery of these laws, or to determine their influence in particular instances where it depends upon any precise degree of distance and quantity. Thus, it is a law of motion, discovered by experience, that the momentum or force of any body in motion is in the compound ratio or proportion of its solid contents and its velocity; and consequently, that a small force may remove the greatest obstacle, or raise the greatest weight, if by any contrivance or machinery, we can increase the velocity of that force, so as to make it an overmatch for its antagonist. Geometry assists us in the application of this law, by giving us the just dimensions of all the parts and figures which can enter into any species of machine; but still the discovery of the law itself is owing merely to experience; and

all the abstract reasonings in the world could never lead us one step towards the knowledge of it. When we reason *a priori*, and consider merely any object or cause, as it appears to the mind, independent of all observation, it never could suggest to us the notion of any distinct object, such as its effect, much less show us the inseparable and inviolable connection between them. A man must be very sagacious who could discover by reasoning, that crystal is the effect of heat, and ice of cold, without being previously acquainted with the operation of these qualities.

PART II.—But we have not yet attained any tolerable satisfaction with regard to the question first proposed. Each solution still gives rise to a new question as difficult as the foregoing, and leads us on to farther inquiries. When it is asked, *What is the nature of all our reasonings concerning matter of fact?* the proper answer seems to be, That they are founded on the relation of cause and effect. When again it is asked, *What is the foundation of all our reasonings and conclusions concerning that relation?* it may be replied in one word EXPERIENCE. But if we still carry on our sifting humour and ask, *What is the foundation of all conclusions from experience?* This implies a new question, which may be of more difficult solution and explication. Philosophers, that give themselves airs of superior wisdom and sufficiency, have a hard task when they encounter persons of inquisitive dispositions, who push them from every corner to which they retreat, and who are sure at last to bring them to some dangerous dilemma. The best expedient to prevent this confusion, is to be modest in our pretensions and even to discover the difficulty ourselves before it is objected to us. By this means we may make a kind of merit of our very ignorance.

I shall content myself in this section, with an easy task, and shall pretend only to give a negative answer to the question here proposed. I say then, that even after we have experience of the operations of cause and effect, our conclusions from that experience are not founded on reasoning, or any process of the understanding. This answer we must endeavour both to explain and to defend.

It must certainly be allowed, that nature has kept us at a great distance from all her secrets, and has afforded us only the knowledge of a few superficial qualities of objects, while she conceals from us those powers and principles on which the influence of these objects entirely depends. Our senses inform us of the colour, weight, and consistence of bread, but neither sense nor reason can ever inform us of those qualities which fit it for the nourishment and support of the human body. Sight or feeling conveys an idea of the actual motion of bodies: but as to that wonderful force or power which would

carry on a moving body for ever in a continued change of place, and which bodies never lose but by communicating it to others, of this we cannot form the most distant conception. But notwithstanding this ignorance of natural powers* and principles, we always presume when we see like sensible qualities, that they have like secret powers, and expect that effects similar to those which we have experienced will follow from them. If a body of like colour and consistence with that bread which we have formerly eat, be presented to us, we make no scruple of repeating the experiment, and foresee, with certainty, like nourishment and support. Now this is a process of the mind or thought, of which I would willingly know the foundation. It is allowed on all hands that there is no known connection between the sensible qualities and the secret powers, and consequently, that the mind is not led to form such a conclusion concerning their constant and regular conjunction, by any thing which it knows of their nature. As to past *Experience*, it can be allowed to give *direct* and *certain* information of those precise objects only, and that precise period of time which fell under its cognizance: but why this experience should be extended to future times, and to other objects, which, for aught we know, may be only in appearance similar, this is the main question on which I would insist. The bread which I formerly eat nourished me, that is, a body of such sensible qualities was, at that time, endued with such secret powers: but does it follow, that other bread must also nourish me at another time, and that like sensible qualities must always be attended with the like secret powers? The consequence seems nowise necessary. At least, it must be acknowledged, that there is here a consequence drawn by the mind, that there is a certain step taken, a process of thought, and an inference, which wants to be explained. These two propositions are far from being the same, *I have found that such an object has always been attended with such an effect*, and *I foresee, that other objects which are, in appearance, similar, will be attended with similar effects.* I shall allow, if you please, that the one proposition may justly be inferred from the other: I know, in fact, that it always is inferred. But if you insist, that the inference is made by a chain of reasoning, I desire you to produce that reasoning. The connection between these propositions is not intuitive. There is required a medium, which may enable the mind to draw such an inference, if indeed it be drawn by reasoning and argument. What that medium is, I must confess passes my comprehension; and it is incumbent on those to produce it who assert, that it exists, and is the original of all our conclusions concerning matter of fact.

This negative argument must certainly, in process of time, become altogether convincing, if many penetrating and able philosophers shall

* The word Power is here used in a loose and popular sense. The more accurate explication of it would give additional evidence to this argument. See Sect. 7.

turn their inquiries this way, and no one be ever able to discover any connecting proposition or intermediate step which supports the understanding in this conclusion. But as the question is yet new, every reader may not trust so far to his own penetration as to conclude, because an argument escapes his inquiry, that therefore it does not really exist. For this reason, it may be requisite to venture upon a more difficult task, and, enumerating all the branches of human knowledge, endeavour to show, that none of them can afford such an argument.

All reasonings may be divided into two kinds, namely, demonstrative reasoning, or that concerning relations of ideas and moral reasoning, or that concerning matter of fact and existence. That there are no demonstrative arguments in the case, seems evident, since it implies no contradiction, that the course of nature may change, and that an object, seemingly like those which we have experienced, may be attended with different or contrary effects. May I not clearly and distinctly conceive, that a body, falling from the clouds, and which in all other respects resembles snow, has yet the taste of salt or feeling of fire? Is there any more intelligible proposition than to affirm, that all the trees will flourish in December and January, and decay in May and June? Now whatever is intelligible, and can be distinctly conceived, implies no contradiction, and can never be proved false by any demonstrative argument or abstract reasoning *a priori*.

If we be, therefore, engaged by arguments to put trust in past experience, and make it the standard of our future judgment, these arguments must be probable only, or such as regard matter of fact and real existence, according to the division above mentioned. But that there is no argument of this kind, must appear, if our explication of that species of reasoning be admitted as solid and satisfactory. We have said that all arguments concerning existence are founded on the relation of cause and effect, that our knowledge of that relation is derived entirely from experience, and that all our experimental conclusions proceed upon the supposition, that the future will be conformable to the past. To endeavour, therefore, the proof of this last supposition by probable arguments, or arguments regarding existence, must be evidently going in a circle, and taking that for granted, which is the very point in question.

In reality, all arguments from experience are founded on the similarity which we discover among natural objects, and by which we are induced to expect effects similar to those which we have found to follow from such objects. And though none but a fool or madman will ever pretend to dispute the authority of experience, or to reject that great guide of human life, it may surely be allowed a philosopher to have so much curiosity, at least, as to examine the principle of human nature which gives this mighty authority to experience, and

makes us draw advantage from that similarity which nature has placed among different objects. From causes which appear similar, we expect similar effects. This is the sum of all our experimental conclusions. Now it seems evident, that if this conclusion were formed by reason, it would be as perfect at first, and upon one instance, as after ever so long a course of experience: but the case is far otherwise. Nothing so like as eggs; yet no one, on account of this appearing similarity, expects the same taste and relish in all of them. It is only after a long course of uniform experiments in any kind, that we attain a firm reliance and security with regard to a particular event. Now, where is that process of reasoning, which, from one instance, draws a conclusion so different from that which it infers from a hundred instances that are nowise different from that single one? This question I propose, as much for the sake of information, as with an intention of raising difficulties. I cannot find, I cannot imagine, any such reasoning. But I keep my mind still open to instruction, if any one will vouchsafe to bestow it on me.

Should it be said, that, from a number of uniform experiments, we *infer* a connection between the sensible qualities and the secret powers; this, I must confess, seems the same difficulty, couched in different terms. The question still occurs, On what process of argument is this *inference* founded? Where is the medium, the interposing ideas, which join propositions so very wide of each other? It is confessed that the colour, consistence and other sensible qualities of bread, appear not of themselves to have any connection with the secret powers of nourishment and support. For otherwise we could infer these secret powers from the first appearance of these sensible qualities, without the aid of experience, contrary to the sentiment of all philosophers, and contrary to plain matter of fact. Here then is our natural state of ignorance with regard to the powers and influence of all objects. How is this remedied by experience? It only shows us a number of uniform effects resulting from certain objects, and teaches us, that those particular objects, at that particular time, were endowed with such powers and forces. When a new object, endowed with similar sensible qualities, is produced, we expect similar powers and forces, and look for a like effect. From a body of like colour and consistence with bread, we expect like nourishment and support. But this surely is a step or progress of the mind which wants to be explained. When a man says, *I have found, in all past instances, such sensible qualities, conjoined with such secret powers*, and when he says, *similar sensible qualities will always be conjoined with similar secret powers*, he is not guilty of a tautology, nor are these propositions in any respect the same. You say that the one proposition is an inference from the other; but you must confess that the inference is not intuitive; neither is it demonstrative. Of what nature is it then? To say it is experimental,

is begging the question. For all inferences from experience suppose, as their foundation, that the future will resemble the past, and that similar powers will be conjoined with similar sensible qualities. If there be any suspicion that the course of nature may change, and that the past may be no rule for the future, all experience becomes useless, and can give rise to no inference or conclusion. It is impossible, therefore, that any arguments from experience can prove this resemblance of the past to the future since all these arguments are founded on the supposition of that resemblance. Let the course of things be allowed hitherto ever so regular, that alone, without some new argument or inference, proves not that for the future it will continue so. In vain do you pretend to have learned the nature of bodies from your past experience Their secret nature, and consequently all their effects and influence, may change, without any change in their sensible qualities. This happens sometimes, and with regard to some objects why may it not happen always, and with regard to all objects? What logic, what process of argument, secures you against this supposition? My practice, you say, refutes my doubts But you mistake the purport of my question As an agent, I am quite satisfied in the point, but as a philosopher, who has some share of curiosity, I will not say scepticism, I want to learn the foundation of this inference No reading, no inquiry, has yet been able to remove my difficulty, or give me satisfaction in a matter of such importance. Can I do better than propose the difficulty to the public, even though perhaps, I have small hopes of obtaining a solution? We shall at least, by this means be sensible of our ignorance, if we do not augment our knowledge

I must confess, that a man is guilty of unpardonable arrogance, who concludes, because an argument has escaped his own investigation, that therefore it does not really exist. I must also confess, that though all the learned, for several ages, should have employed themselves in fruitless search upon any subject, it may still, perhaps, be rash to conclude positively, that the subject must therefore pass all human comprehension. Even though we examine all the sources of our knowledge, and conclude them unfit for such a subject, there may still remain a suspicion, that the enumeration is not complete, or the examination not accurate. But with regard to the present subject, there are some considerations which seem to remove all this accusation of arrogance or suspicion of mistake.

It is certain, that the most ignorant and stupid peasants, nay infants, nay even brute beasts, improve by experience, and learn the qualities of natural objects, by observing the effects which result from them. When a child has felt the sensation of pain from touching the flame of a candle, he will be careful not to put his hand near any candle; but will expect a similar effect from a cause, which is similar in its sensible qualities and appearance. If you assert, therefore, that the under-

standing of the child is led into this conclusion by any process of argument or ratiocination, I may justly require you to produce that argument? nor have you any pretence to refuse so equitable a demand You cannot say, that the argument is abstruse, and may possibly escape your inquiry, since you confess that it is obvious to the capacity of a mere infant If you hesitate, therefore, a moment, or if, after reflection, you produce an intricate or profound argument, you, in a manner, give up the question and confess, that it is not reasoning which engages us to suppose the past resembling the future, and to expect similar effects from causes, which are to appearance similar This is the proposition which I intended to enforce in the present section. If I be right, I pretend not to have made any mighty discovery. And if I be wrong, I must acknowledge myself to be indeed a very backward scholar, since I cannot now discover an argument, which, it seems, was perfectly familiar to me long before I was out of my cradle.

SECTION V—SCEPTICAL SOLUTION OF THESE DOUBTS

PART I—The passion for philosophy, like that for religion, seems liable to this inconvenience, that though it aims at the correction of our manners, and extirpation of our vices, it may only serve, by imprudent management, to foster a predominant inclination, and push the mind, with more determined resolution, towards that side which already *draws* too much, by the bias and propensity of the natural temper It is certain, that, while we aspire to the magnanimous firmness of the philosophic sage, and endeavour to confine our pleasures altogether within our own minds, we may, at last, render our philosophy like that of Epictetus, and other *Stoics*, only a more refined system of selfishness, and reason ourselves out of all virtue as well as social enjoyment. While we study with attention the vanity of human life, and turn all our thoughts towards the empty and transitory nature of riches and honours, we are, perhaps, all the while, flattering our natural indolence, which, hating the bustle of the world, and drudgery of business, seeks a pretence of reason to give itself a full and uncontrolled indulgence. There is, however, one species of philosophy which seems little liable to this inconvenience, and that because it strikes in with no disorderly passion of the human mind, nor can mingle itself with any natural affection or propensity; and that is the Academic or Sceptical philosophy. The academics always talk of doubt and

suspense of judgment, of danger in hasty determinations, of confining to very narrow bounds the inquiries of the understanding, and of renouncing all speculations which lie not within the limits of common life and practice Nothing, therefore, can be more contrary than such a philosophy to the supine indolence of the mind, its rash arrogance, its lofty pretensions, and its superstitious credulity Every passion is mortified by it, except the love of truth , and that passion never is, nor can be carried to too high a degree It is surprising, therefore, that this philosophy, which, in almost every instance, must be harmless and innocent, should be the subject of so much groundless reproach and obloquy But, perhaps, the very circumstance which renders it so innocent, is what chiefly exposes it to the public hatred and resentment. By flattering no irregular passion, it gains few partizans by opposing so many vices and follies, it raises to itself abundance of enemies, who stigmatize it as libertine and profane

Nor need we fear, that this philosophy, while it endeavours to limit our inquiries to common life, should ever undermine the reasonings of common life and carry its doubts so far as to destroy all action as well as speculation Nature will always maintain her rights, and prevail in the end over any abstract reasoning whatsoever Though we should conclude for instance, as in the foregoing section, that, in all reasonings from experience, there is a step taken by the mind, which is not supported by any argument or process of the understanding , there is no danger that these reasonings, on which almost all knowledge depends, will ever be affected by such a discovery If the mind be not engaged by argument to make this step, it must be induced by some other principle of equal weight and authority , and that principle will preserve its influence as long as human nature remains the same. What that principle is, may well be worth the pains of inquiry

Suppose a person, though endowed with the strongest faculties of reason and reflection, to be brought on a sudden into this world , he would, indeed, immediately observe a continual succession of objects, and one event following another , but he would not be able to discover any thing farther He would not at first, by any reasoning, be able to reach the idea of cause and effect , since the particular powers, by which all natural operations are performed, never appear to the senses, nor is it reasonable to conclude, merely because one event in one instance precedes another, that therefore the one is the cause, the other the effect. Their conjunction may be arbitrary and casual. There may be no reason to infer the existence of one from the appearance of the other and in a word, such a person, without more experience, could never employ his conjecture or reasoning concerning any matter of fact, or be assured of any thing beyond what was immediately present to his memory or senses.

Suppose again, that he has acquired more experience, and has lived

so long in the world as to have observed similar objects or events to be constantly conjoined together, what is the consequence of this experience? He immediately infers the existence of one object from the appearance of the other yet he has not, by all his experience, acquired any idea or knowledge of the secret power, by which the one object produces the other, nor is it, by any process of reasoning, he is engaged to draw this inference, but still he finds himself determined to draw it, and though he should be convinced that his understanding has no part in the operation, he would nevertheless continue in the same course of thinking There is some other principle which determines him to form such a conclusion

This principle is CUSTOM or HABIT For wherever the repetition of any particular act or operation produces a propensity to renew the same act or operation, without being impelled by any reasoning or process of the understanding, we always say, that this propensity is the effect of *Custom* By employing that word, we pretend not to have given the ultimate reason of such a propensity We only point out a principle of human nature, which is universally acknowledged, and which is well known by its effects Perhaps we can push our inquiries no farther, or pretend to give the cause of this cause but must rest contented with it as the ultimate principle, which we can assign, of all our conclusions from experience It is sufficient satisfaction, that we can go so far, without repining at the narrowness of our faculties, because they will carry us no farther And it is certain we here advance a very intelligible proposition at least, if not a true one, when we assert, that, after the constant conjunction of two objects, heat and flame, for instance, weight and solidity, we are determined by custom alone to expect the one from the appearance of the other This hypothesis seems even the only one which explains the difficulty, why we draw, from a thousand instances, an inference which we are not able to draw from one instance that is, in no respect, different from them. Reason is incapable of any such variation The conclusions which it draws from considering one circle, are the same which it would form upon surveying all the circles in the universe. But no man, having seen only one body move after being impelled by another, could infer, that every other body will move after a like impulse. All inferences from experience, therefore, are effects of custom, not of reasoning.*

* Nothing is more usual than for writers, even on *moral*, *political*, or *physical* subjects, to distinguish between *reason* and *experience* and to suppose that these species of argumentation are entirely different from each other. The former are taken for the mere result of our intellectual faculties, which, by considering *a priori* the nature of things, and examining the effects that must follow from their operation, establish particular principles of science and philosophy. The latter are supposed to be derived entirely from sense and observation, by which we learn what has actually resulted from the operation of particular objects, and are thence able to infer what will for the future result from them. Thus, for instance, the limitations and restraints of civil government, and a legal constitution, may be defended, either from reason, which, reflecting on the great frailty and corruption of human nature,

Custom, then, is the great guide of human life. It is that principle alone which renders our experience useful to us, and makes us expect, for the future, a similar train of events with those which have appeared in the past. Without the influence of custom, we should be entirely ignorant of every matter of fact, beyond what is immediately present to the memory and senses. We should never know how to adjust means to ends, or to employ our natural powers in the production of any effect. There would be an end at once of all action as well as of the chief part of speculation.

But here it may be proper to remark, that though our conclusions from experience carry us beyond our memory and senses, and assure us of matters of fact which happened in the most distant places and most remote ages; yet some fact must always be present to the senses or memory, from which we may first proceed in drawing these conclusions. A man, who should find in a desert country the remains of pompous buildings, would conclude, that the country had, in ancient times, been cultivated by civilized inhabitants; but did nothing of this nature occur to him, he could never form such an inference. We learn the events of former ages from history; but then we must peruse the

teaches, that no man can safely be trusted with unlimited authority: or from *experience* and history, which inform us of the enormous abuses that ambition, in every age and country, has been found to make of so imprudent a confidence.

The same distinction between reason and experience is maintained in all our deliberations concerning the conduct of life; while the experienced statesman, general, physician, or merchant, is trusted and followed; and the unpractised novice, with whatever natural talents endowed, neglected and despised. Though it be allowed that reason may form very plausible conjectures with regard to the consequences of such a particular conduct in such particular circumstances; it is still supposed imperfect, without the assistance of experience, which is alone able to give stability and certainty to the maxims which are derived from study and reflection.

But notwithstanding that this distinction be thus universally received, both in the active and speculative scenes of life, I shall not scruple to pronounce, that it is, at bottom, erroneous, or at least superficial.

If we examine those arguments, which, in any of the sciences above mentioned, are supposed to be the mere effects of reasoning and reflection, there will be found to terminate, at last, in some general principle or conclusion, for which we can assign no reason but observation and experience. The only difference between them and those maxims, which are vulgarly esteemed the result of pure experience, is, that the former cannot be established without some process of thought, and some reflection on what we have observed, in order to distinguish its circumstances, and trace its consequences: whereas in the latter, the experienced event is exactly and fully similar to that which we infer as the result of any particular situation. The history of a Tiberius or a Nero makes us dread a like tyranny, were our monarchs freed from the restraints of laws and senates: but the observation of any fraud or cruelty in private life is sufficient, with the aid of a little thought, to give us the same apprehension; while it serves as an instance of the general corruption of human nature, and shews us the danger which we must incur by reposing an entire confidence in mankind. In both cases, it is experience which is ultimately the foundation of our inference and conclusion.

There is no man so young and unexperienced, as not to have formed, from observation, many general and just maxims concerning human affairs and the conduct of life; but it must be confessed, that, when a man comes to put these in practice, he will be extremely liable to error, till time and farther experience both enlarge these maxims, and teach him their proper use and application. In every situation or incident, there are many particular and [illegible] minute circumstances, which the man of greatest talents is at first apt to overlook, though on them the justness of his conclusions, and consequently the prudence of his [illegible] depend. Not to mention, that, to a young beginner, the general [illegible] occur not always on the proper occasions, nor can be immediately applied [illegible] and distinction. The truth is, an unexperienced reasoner could be no [illegible] absolutely unexperienced; and when we assign that character to any [illegible] in a comparative sense, and suppose him possessed of experience [illegible] imperfect degree.

volumes in which this instruction is contained, and thence carry up our inferences from one testimony to another, till we arrive at the eye-witnesses and spectators of these distant events. In a word, if we proceed not upon some fact present to the memory or senses, our reasonings would be merely hypothetical; and however the particular links might be connected with each other, the whole chain of inferences would have nothing to support it, nor could we ever by its means arrive at the knowledge of any real existence. If I ask, why you believe any particular matter of fact which you relate, you must tell me some reason; and this reason will be some other fact connected with it. But as you cannot proceed after this manner *in infinitum*, you must at last terminate in some fact which is present to your memory or senses, or must allow that your belief is entirely without foundation.

What then is the conclusion of the whole matter? A simple one; though, it must be confessed, pretty remote from the common theories of philosophy. All belief of matter of fact or real existence is derived merely from some object present to the memory or senses, and a customary conjunction between that and some other object; or in other words, having found, in many instances, that any two kinds of objects, flame and heat, snow and cold, have always been conjoined together; if flame or snow be presented anew to the senses, the mind is carried by custom to expect heat or cold, and to *believe*, that such a quality does exist, and will discover itself upon a nearer approach. This belief is the necessary result of placing the mind in such circumstances. It is an operation of the soul, when we are so situated, as unavoidable as to feel the passion of love, when we receive benefits; or hatred, when we meet with injuries. All these operations are a species of natural instincts, which no reasoning or process of the thought and understanding is able either to produce or to prevent.

At this point, it would be very allowable for us to stop our philosophical researches. In most questions, we can never make a single step farther; and in all questions we must terminate here at last, after our most restless and curious inquiries. But still our curiosity will be pardonable, perhaps commendable, if it carry us on to still farther researches, and make us examine more accurately the nature of this *belief*, and of the *customary conjunction*, whence it is derived. By this means we may meet with some explications and analogies that will give satisfaction, at least to such as love the abstract sciences, and can be entertained with speculations, which, however accurate, may still retain a degree of doubt and uncertainty. As to readers of a different taste, the remaining part of this section is not calculated for them; and the following inquiries may well be understood, though it be [illegible]

PART II — Nothing is more free than the imagination of man, and though it cannot exceed that original stock of ideas, furnished by the internal and external senses, it has unlimited power of mixing, compounding, separating, and dividing these ideas, in all the varieties of fiction and vision It can feign a train of events with all the appearance of reality, ascribe to them a particular time and place, conceive them as existent, and paint them out to itself with every circumstance that belongs to any historical fact, which it believes with the greatest certainty Wherein, therefore, consists the difference between such a fiction and belief? It lies not merely in any peculiar idea which is annexed to such a conception as commands our assent, and which is wanting to every known fiction For as the mind has authority over all its ideas, it could voluntarily annex this particular idea to any fiction, and consequently be able to believe whatever it pleases, contrary to what we find by daily experience We can, in our conception, join the head of a man to the body of a horse, but it is not in our power to believe that such an animal has ever really existed

It follows, therefore, that the difference between *fiction* and *belief* lies in some sentiment or feeling which is annexed to the latter, not to the former, and which depends not on the will, nor can be commanded at pleasure It must be excited by nature like all other sentiments, and must arise from the particular situation in which the mind is placed at any particular juncture Whenever any object is presented to the memory or senses, it immediately, by the force of custom carries the imagination to conceive that object which is usually conjoined to it, and this conception is attended with a feeling or sentiment different from the loose reveries of the fancy In this consists the whole nature of belief For as there is no matter of fact which we believe so firmly, that we cannot conceive the contrary, there would be no difference between the conception assented to, and that which is rejected, were it not for some sentiment which distinguishes the one from the other If I see a billiard ball moving towards another on a smooth table, I can easily conceive it to stop upon contact. This conception implies no contradiction, but still it feels very differently from that conception by which I represent to myself the impulse and the communication of motion from one ball to another

Were we to attempt a *definition* of this sentiment, we should, perhaps, find it very difficult, if not an impossible task, in the same manner as if we should endeavour to define the feeling of cold, or passion of anger, to a creature who never had any experience of these sentiments. Belief is the true and proper name of this feeling; and no one is ever at a loss to know the meaning of that term; because every man is every moment conscious of the sentiment represented by it. It may not, however, be improper to attempt a *description* of this sentiment; in hopes we may, by that means, arrive at some analogies

which may afford a more perfect explication of it. I say, then, that belief is nothing but a more vivid, lively, forcible, firm, steady conception of an object, than what the imagination alone is ever able to attain. This variety of terms, which may seem so unphilosophical, is intended only to express that act of the mind which renders realities, or what is taken for such, more present to us than fictions, causes them to weigh more in the thought, and gives them a superior influence on the passions and imagination. Provided we agree about the thing, it is needless to dispute about the terms. The imagination has the command over all its ideas, and can join, and mix, and vary them, in all the ways possible. It may conceive fictitious objects with all the circumstances of place and time. It may set them in a manner before our eyes, in their true colours, just as they might have existed. But as it is impossible, that this faculty of imagination can ever, of itself, reach belief, it is evident that belief consists not in the peculiar nature or order of ideas, but in the *manner* of their conception, and in their *feeling* to the mind. I confess, that it is impossible perfectly to explain this feeling or manner of conception. We may make use of words which express something near it. But its true and proper name, as we observed before, is *belief*, which is a term that every one sufficiently understands in common life. And in philosophy we can go no farther than assert, that *belief* is something felt by the mind, which distinguishes the ideas of the judgment from the fictions of the imagination. It gives them more weight and influence, makes them appear of greater importance, enforces them in the mind, and renders them the governing principles of our actions. I hear at present, for instance, a person's voice, with whom I am acquainted, and the sound comes as from the next room. This impression of my senses immediately conveys my thought to the person together with all the surrounding objects. I paint them out to myself as existing at present, with the same qualities and relations of which I formerly knew them possessed. These ideas take faster hold of my mind than ideas of an enchanted castle. They are very different to the feeling, and have a much greater influence of every kind, either to give pleasure or pain, joy or sorrow.

Let us, then, take in the whole compass of this doctrine, and allow that the sentiment of belief is nothing but a conception more intense and steady than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination, and that this *manner* of conception arises from a customary conjunction of the object with something present to the memory or senses. I believe that it will not be difficult, upon these suppositions, to find other operations of the mind analogous to it, and trace up these phenomena to principles still more general.

We have already observed, that nature has established connections among particular ideas, and that no sooner one idea occurs to our

thoughts than it introduces its correlative, and carries our attention towards it, by a gentle and insensible movement. These principles of connection or association we have reduced to three, namely, *Resemblance*, *Contiguity*, and *Causation*, which are the only bonds that unite our thoughts together, and beget that regular train of reflection or discourse, which, in a greater or less degree, takes place among all mankind. Now here arises a question, on which the solution of the present difficulty will depend. Does it happen in all these relations, that, when one of the objects is presented to the senses or memory, the mind is not only carried to the conception of the correlative, but reaches a steadier and stronger conception of it than what otherwise it would have been able to attain? This seems to be the case with that belief which arises from the relation of cause and effect. And if the case be the same with the other relations or principles of association, this may be established as a general law, which takes place in all the operations of the mind

We may, therefore, observe, as the first experiment to our present purpose, that, upon the appearance of the picture of an absent friend, our idea of him is evidently enlivened by the *Resemblance*, and that every passion, which that idea occasions, whether of joy or sorrow, acquires new force and vigour In producing this effect, there concur both a relation and a present impression Where the picture bears no resemblance to him, at least was not intended for him, it never so much as conveys our thought to him And where it is absent, as well as the person, though the mind may pass from the thought of one to that of the other it feels its idea to be rather weakened than enlivened by that transition We take a pleasure in viewing the picture of a friend when it is set before us, but when it is removed, rather chuse to consider him directly, than by reflection in an image, which is equally distant and obscure

The ceremonies of the Roman Catholic religion may be considered as instances of the same nature The devotees of that superstition usually plead in excuse for the mummeries with which they are upbraided, that they feel the good effect of those external motions, and postures, and actions, in enlivening their devotion and quickening their fervour, which otherwise would decay, if directed entirely to distant and immaterial objects. We shadow out the objects of our faith, say they, in sensible types and images, and render them more present to us by the immediate presence of these types, than it is possible for us to do, merely by an intellectual view and contemplation Sensible objects have always a greater influence on the fancy than any other, and this influence they readily convey to those ideas, to which they are related, and which they resemble I shall only infer from these practices, and this reasoning, that the effect of resemblance in enlivening the ideas is very common; and as in every case a resem-

blance and a present impression must concur, we are abundantly supplied with experiments to prove the reality of the foregoing principle.

We may add force to these experiments by others of a different kind, in considering the effects of *contiguity* as well as of *resemblance*. It is certain, that distance diminishes the force of every idea, and that upon our approach to any object, though it does not discover itself to our senses, it operates upon the mind with an influence, which imitates an immediate impression. The thinking on any object readily transports the mind to what is contiguous; but it is only the actual presence of an object, that transports it with a superior vivacity. When I am a few miles from home, whatever relates to it touches me more nearly than when I am two hundred leagues distant; though even at that distance the reflecting on any thing in the neighbourhood of my friends or family naturally produces an idea of them. But as in this latter case, both the objects of the mind are ideas; notwithstanding there is an easy transition between them; that transition alone is not able to give a superior vivacity to any of the ideas, for want of some immediate impression.*

No one can doubt but causation has the same influence as the other two relations of resemblance and contiguity. Superstitious people are fond of the reliques of saints and holy men, for the same reason that they seek after types or images, in order to enliven their devotion, and give them a more intimate and strong conception of those exemplary lives which they desire to imitate. Now it is evident that one of the best reliques which a devotee could procure, would be the handy-work of a saint; and if his clothes and furniture are ever to be considered in this light, it is because they were once at his disposal and were moved and affected by him; in which respect they are to be considered as imperfect effects, and as connected with him by a shorter chain of consequences than any of those by which we learn the reality of his existence.

Suppose that the son of a friend, who had been long dead or absent, were presented to us; it is evident, that this object would instantly revive its correlative idea, and recall to our thoughts all past intimacies and familiarities, in more lively colours than they would otherwise have appeared to us. This is another phenomenon, which seems to prove the principle above mentioned.

* 'Naturane nobis, inquit, datum dicam, an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis moveamur, quam siquando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus aut scriptum aliquod legamus? Velut ego nunc moveor. Venit enim mihi Platonis in mentem, quem accepimus primum hic disputare solitum: cujus etiam illi hortuli propinqui non memoriam solum mihi afferunt, sed ipsum videntur in conspectu meo hic ponere. Hic Speusippus, hic Xenocrates, hic ejus auditor Polemo; cujus ipsa illa sessio fuit, quam videmus. Equidem etiam curiam nostram, Hostiliam dico, non hanc novam, quæ mihi minor esse videtur postquam est major, solebam intuens, Scipionem, Lælium, nostrum vero in primis avum cogitare. Tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis; ut non sine causa ex his memoriæ deducta sit disciplina.'—*Cicero de Finibus. Lib. 5.*

We may observe, that in these phenomena, the belief of the correlative object is always presupposed, without which the relation could have no effect. The influence of the picture supposes, that we *believe* our friend to have once existed Contiguity to home can never excite our ideas of home, unless we *believe* that it really exists. Now I assert, that this belief, where it reaches beyond the memory or senses, is of a similar nature, and arises from similar causes, with the transition of thought and vivacity of conception here explained. When I throw a piece of dry wood into a fire, my mind is immediately carried to conceive, that it augments, not extinguishes, the flame This transition of thought from the cause to the effect proceeds not from reason. It derives its origin altogether from custom and experience. And as it first begins from an object, present to the senses, it renders the idea or conception of flame more strong or lively than any loose, floating reverie of the imagination That idea arises immediately The thought moves instantly towards it, and conveys to it all that force of conception which is derived from the impression present to the senses. When a sword is levelled at my breast, does not the idea of wound and pain strike me more strongly, than when a glass of wine is presented to me, even though by accident this idea should occur after the appearance of the latter object? But what is there in this whole matter to cause such a strong conception, except only a present object and a customary transition to the idea of another object, which we have been accustomed to conjoin with the former? This is the whole operation of the mind, in all our conclusions concerning matter of fact and existence and it is a satisfaction to find some analogies, by which it may be explained. The transition from a present object does in all cases give strength and solidity to the related idea

Here, then, is a kind of pre-established harmony between the course of nature and the succession of our ideas, and though the powers and forces, by which the former is governed, be wholly unknown to us, yet our thoughts and conceptions have still, we find, gone on in the same train with the other works of nature Custom is that principle by which this correspondence has been effected, so necessary to the subsistence of our species, and the regulation of our conduct, in every circumstance and occurrence of human life Had not the presence of an object instantly excited the idea of those objects commonly conjoined with it, all our knowledge must have been limited to the narrow sphere of our memory and senses, and we should never have been able to adjust means to ends, or employ our natural powers, either to the producing of good, or avoiding of evil. Those who delight in the discovery and contemplation of *final causes*, have here ample subject to employ their wonder and admiration.

I shall add, for a further confirmation of the foregoing theory, that, as this operation of the mind, by which we infer like effects from like

causes, and *vice versa*, is so essential to the subsistence of all human creatures, it is not probable, that it could be trusted to the fallacious deductions of our reason, which is slow in its operation, appears not, in any degree, during the first years of infancy, and at best is, in every age and period of human life, extremely liable to error and mistake. It is more conformable to the ordinary wisdom of nature to secure so necessary an act of the mind, by some instinct or mechanical tendency, which may be infallible in its operations, may discover itself at the first appearance of life and thought, and may be independent of all the laboured deductions of the understanding. As nature has taught us the use of our limbs, without giving us the knowledge of the muscles and nerves by which they are actuated, so has she implanted in us an instinct, which carries forward the thought in a correspondent course to that which she has established among external objects, though we are ignorant of those powers and forces on which this regular course and succession of objects totally depends.

SECTION VI.—OF PROBABILITY.*

Though there be no such thing as *Chance* in the world, our ignorance of the real cause of any event has the same influence on the understanding, and begets a like species of belief or opinion.

There is certainly a probability, which arises from a superiority of chances on any side, and according as this superiority increases, and surpasses the opposite chances, the probability receives a proportionable increase, and begets still a higher degree of belief or assent to that side in which we discover the superiority. If a die were marked with one figure or number of spots on four sides, and with another figure or number of spots on the two remaining sides, it would be more probable, that the former would turn up than the latter, though, if it had a thousand sides marked in the same manner, and only one side different, the probability would be much higher, and our belief or expectation of the event more steady and secure. This process of the thought or reasoning may seem trivial and obvious, but to those who consider it more narrowly, it may, perhaps, afford matter for curious speculation.

* Mr. Locke divides all arguments into demonstrative and probable. In this view, we must say, that it is only probable all men must die, or that the sun will rise to-morrow. But to conform our language more to common use, we ought to divide arguments into demonstrations, *proofs*, and *probabilities*. By proofs, meaning such arguments from experience as leave no room for doubt or opposition.

It seems evident, that when the mind looks forward to discover the event, which may result from the throw of such a die, it considers the turning up of each particular side alike probable; and this is the very nature of chance, to render all the particular events, comprehended in it, entirely equal. But finding a greater number of sides concur in the one event than in the other, the mind is carried more frequently to that event, and meets it oftener, in revolving the various possibilities or chances, on which the ultimate result depends. This concurrence of several views in one particular event begets immediately, by an explicable contrivance of nature, the sentiment of belief, and gives that event the advantage over its antagonist, which is supported by a smaller number of views, and recurs less frequently to the mind. If we allow, that belief is nothing but a firmer and stronger conception of an object than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination, this operation may, perhaps, in some measure, be accounted for. The concurrence of these several views or glimpses imprints the idea more strongly on the imagination; gives it superior force and vigour; renders its influence on the passions and affections more sensible; and in a word, begets that reliance or security, which constitutes the nature of belief and opinion.

The case is the same with the probability of causes as with that of chance. There are some causes which are entirely uniform and constant in producing a particular effect; and no instance has ever yet been found of any failure or irregularity in their operation. Fire has always burned, and water suffocated, every human creature: the production of motion by impulse and gravity is an universal law, which has hitherto admitted of no exception. But there are other causes, which have been found more irregular and uncertain; nor has rhubarb always proved a purge, or opium a soporific, to every one who has taken these medicines. It is true, when any cause fails of producing its usual effect, philosophers ascribe not this to any irregularity in nature; but suppose that some secret causes, in the particular structure of parts, have prevented the operation. Our reasonings, however, and conclusions, concerning the event, are the same as if this principle had no place. Being determined by custom to transfer the past to the future, in all our inferences, where the past has been entirely regular and uniform, we expect the event with the greatest assurance, and leave no room for any contrary supposition. But where different effects have been found to follow from causes, which are to *appearance* exactly similar, all these various effects must occur to the mind in transferring the past to the future, and enter into our consideration when we determine the probability of the event. Though we give the preference to that which has been found most usual, and believe that this effect will exist, we must not overlook the other effects, but must assign to each of them a particular weight and

authority, in proportion as we have found it to be more or less frequent. It is more probable, in almost every country of Europe, that there will be frost some time in January, than that the weather will continue open throughout that whole month, though this probability varies according to the different climates, and approaches to a certainty in the more northern kingdoms. Here then it seems evident, that, when we transfer the past to the future, in order to determine the effect which will result from any cause, we transfer all the different events, in the same proportion as they have appeared in the past, and conceive one to have existed a hundred times, for instance, another ten times, and another once. As a great number of views do here concur in one event, they fortify and confirm it to the imagination, beget that sentiment which we call *belief*, and give its object the preference above the contrary event, which is not supported by an equal number of experiments, and recurs not so frequently to the thought in transferring the past to the future. Let any one try to account for this operation of the mind upon any one of the received systems of philosophy, and he will be sensible of the difficulty. For my part, I shall think it sufficient, if the present hints excite the curiosity of philosophers, and make them sensible how defective all common theories are in treating of such curious and such sublime subjects.

SECTION VII.—OF THE IDEA OF NECESSARY CONNECTION.

PART I.—THE great advantage of the mathematical sciences above the moral consists in this, that the ideas of the former, being sensible, are always clear and determinate, the smallest distinction between them is immediately perceptible, and the same terms are still expressive of the same ideas, without ambiguity or variation. An oval is never mistaken for a circle, nor an hyperbola for an ellipsis. The isosceles and scalenum are distinguished by boundaries more exact than vice and virtue, right and wrong. If any term be defined in geometry, the mind readily, of itself, substitutes, on all occasions, the definition for the term defined: or even when no definition is employed, the object itself may be presented to the senses, and by that means be steadily and clearly apprehended. But the finer sentiments of the mind, the operations of the understanding, the various agitations of the passions, though really in themselves distinct, easily escape us, when surveyed by reflection; nor is it in our power to recall the original object, as

often as we have occasion to contemplate it. Ambiguity, by this means, is gradually introduced into our reasonings similar objects are readily taken to be the same and the conclusion becomes at last very wide of the premises.

One may safely, however, affirm, that, if we consider these sciences in a proper light, their advantages and disadvantages nearly compensate each other, and reduce both of them to a state of equality. If the mind, with greater facility, retains the ideas of geometry clear and determinate, it must carry on a much longer and more intricate chain of reasoning, and compare ideas much wider of each other, in order to reach the abstruser truths of that science And if moral ideas are apt, without extreme care, to fall into obscurity and confusion, the inferences are always much shorter in these disquisitions, and the intermediate steps, which lead to the conclusion, much fewer than in the sciences, which treat of quantity and number In reality, there is scarcely a proposition in Euclid so simple as not to consist of more parts, than are to be found in any moral reasoning which runs not into chimera and conceit Where we trace the principles of the human mind through a few steps we may be very well satisfied with our progress, considering how soon nature throws a bar to all our inquiries concerning causes, and reduces us to an acknowledgment of our ignorance The chief obstacle, therefore, to our improvement in the moral or metaphysical sciences, is the obscurity of the ideas, and ambiguity of the terms. The principal difficulty in the mathematics is the length of inferences and compass of thought, requisite to the forming of any conclusion And, perhaps, our progress in natural philosophy is chiefly retarded by the want of proper experiments and phenomena, which are often discovered by chance, and cannot always be found when requisite, even by the most diligent and prudent inquiry As moral philosophy seems hitherto to have received less improvement than either geometry or physics, we may conclude that, if there be any difference in this respect among these sciences the difficulties which obstruct the progress of the former require superior care and capacity to be surmounted

There are no ideas which occur in metaphysics more obscure and uncertain than those of *power*, *force*, *energy*, or *necessary connection*, of which it is every moment necessary for us to treat in all our disquisitions We shall therefore endeavour, in this section, to fix, if possible, the precise meaning of these terms, and thereby remove some part of that obscurity which is so much complained of in this species of philosophy

It seems a proposition which will not admit of much dispute, that all our ideas are nothing but copies of our impressions, or, in other words, that it is impossible for us to *think* of anything which we have not antecedently *felt*, either by our external or internal senses. I have

endeavoured [Section II.] to explain and prove this proposition, and have expressed my hopes, that, by a proper application of it, men may reach a greater clearness and precision in philosophical reasonings than what they have hitherto been able to attain. Complex ideas may, perhaps, be well known by definition, which is nothing but an enumeration of those parts or simple ideas that compose them. But when we have pushed up definitions to the most simple ideas, and find still some ambiguity and obscurity; what resource are we then possessed of? By what invention can we throw light upon these ideas, and render them altogether precise and determinate to our intellectual view? Produce the impressions or original sentiments from which the ideas are copied. These impressions are all strong and sensible. They admit not of ambiguity. They are not only placed in a full light themselves, but may throw light on their correspondent ideas, which lie in obscurity. And by this means we may perhaps attain a new microscope or species of optics, by which, in the moral sciences, the most minute, and most simple ideas, may be so enlarged as to fall readily under our apprehension, and be equally known with the grossest and most sensible ideas that can be the object of our inquiry.

To be fully acquainted, therefore, with the idea of power or necessary connection, let us examine its impression; and, in order to find the impression with greater certainty, let us search for it in all the sources from which it may possibly be derived.

When we look about us towards external objects, and consider the operation of causes, we are never able in a single instance, to discover any power or necessary connection; any quality which binds the effect to the cause, and renders the one an infallible consequence of the other. We only find that the one does actually in fact follow the other. The impulse of one billiard ball is attended with motion in the second. This is the whole that appears to the *outward* senses. The mind feels no sentiment or *inward* impression from this succession of objects: consequently there is not, in any single particular instance of cause and effect, any thing which can suggest the idea of power or necessary connection.

From the first appearance of an object, we can never conjecture what effect will result from it. But were the power or energy of any cause discoverable by the mind, we could foresee the effect, even without experience; and might, at first, pronounce with certainty concerning it, by the mere dint of thought and reasoning.

In reality, there is no part of matter that does ever by its sensible qualities, discover any power or energy, or give us ground to imagine, that it could produce any thing, or be followed by any other object, which we could denominate its effect. Solidity, extension, motion; these qualities are all complete in themselves; and never point out any other event which may result from them. The scenes of the uni-

verse are continually shifting, and one object follows another in an uninterrupted succession; but the power or force, which actuates the whole machine, is entirely concealed from us, and never discovers itself in any of the sensible qualities of body. We know, that, in fact, heat is a constant attendant of flame; but what is the connection between them, we have no room so much as to conjecture or imagine. It is impossible, therefore, that the idea of power can be derived from the contemplation of bodies, in single instances of their operation; because no bodies ever discover any power, which can be the original of this idea.*

Since, therefore, external objects, as they appear to the senses, give us no idea of power or necessary connection, by their operation in particular instances, let us see, whether this idea be derived from reflection on the operations of our own minds, and be copied from any internal impression. It may be said, that we are every moment conscious of internal power; while we feel, that, by the simple command of our will, we can move the organs of our body, or direct the faculties of our mind. An act of volition produces motion in our limbs, or raises a new idea in our imagination. This influence of the will we know by consciousness. Hence we acquire the idea of power or energy; and are certain, that we ourselves and all other intelligent beings are possessed of power. This idea, then, is an idea of reflection, since it arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and on the command which is exercised by will, both over the organs of the body and faculties of the soul.

We shall proceed to examine this pretension; and first, with regard to the influence of volition over the organs of the body. This influence, we may observe, is a fact, which, like all other natural events, can be known only by experience, and can never be foreseen from any apparent energy or power in the cause, which connects it with the effect, and renders the one an infallible consequence of the other. The motion of our body follows upon the command of our will. Of this we are every moment conscious. But the means, by which this is effected; the energy, by which the will performs so extraordinary an operation; of this we are so far from being immediately conscious, that it must for ever escape our most diligent inquiry.

I. Is there any principle in all nature more mysterious than the union of soul with body; by which a supposed spiritual substance acquires such an influence over a material one, that the most refined thought is able to actuate the grossest matter? Were we empowered, by a secret wish, to remove mountains, or control the planets in

* Mr. Locke, in his chapter of power, says, that finding from experience, that there are several new productions in matter, and concluding that there must somewhere be a power capable of producing them, we arrive at last by this reasoning at the idea of power. But no reasoning can ever give us a new, original, simple idea; as this philosopher himself confesses. This, therefore, can never be the origin of that idea.

their orbit; this extensive authority would not be more extraordinary, nor more beyond our comprehension. But if by consciousness we perceived any power or energy in the will, we must know this power; we must know its connection with the effect, we must know the secret union of soul and body, and the nature of both these substances; by which the one is able to operate in so many instances, upon the other.

II. We are not able to move all the organs of the body with a like authority, though we cannot assign any reason, besides experience, for so remarkable a difference between one and the other. Why has the will an influence over the tongue and fingres, not over the heart or liver? This question would never embarrass us, were we conscious of a power in the former case, not in the latter. We should then perceive, independent of experience, why the authority of will over the organs of the body is circumscribed within such particular limits. Being in that case fully acquainted with the power or force by which it operates, we should also know, why its influence reaches precisely to such boundaries, and no farther.

A man, suddenly struck with a palsy in the leg or arm, or who had newly lost those members, frequently endeavours, at first, to move them, and employ them in their offices. Here he is as much conscious of power to command such limbs, as a man in perfect health is conscious of power to actuate any member which remains in its natural state and condition. But consciousness never deceives. Consequently, neither in the one case nor in the other, are we ever conscious of any power. We learn the influence of our will from experience alone. And experience only teaches us, how one event constantly follows another, without instructing us in the secret connection which binds them together, and renders them inseparable.

III. We learn from anatomy, that the immediate object of power in voluntary motion, is not the member itself which is moved, but certain muscles, and nerves, and animal spirits, and, perhaps, something still more minute and more unknown, through which the motion is successively propagagated, ere it reach the member itself whose motion is the immediate object of volition. Can there be a more certain proof, that the power, by which this whole operation is performed, so far from being directly and fully known by an inward sentiment or consciousness, is to the last degree mysterious and unintelligible? Here the mind wills a certain event: immediately another event, unknown to ourselves, and totally different from the one intended, is produced. this event produces another, equally unknown: till at last, through a long succession, the desired event is produced. But if the original power were felt, it must be known: were it known, its effect must also be known; since all power is relative to its effect. And vice versa, if the effect be not known the power cannot be known, nor felt. How indeed can we be conscious of a power to move our limbs, when

we have no such power but only that to move certain animal spirits, which, though they produce at last the motion of our limbs, yet operate in such a manner as is wholly beyond our comprehension?

We may, therefore, conclude from the whole, I hope, without any temerity, though with assurance, that our idea of power is not copied from any sentiment on consciousness of power within ourselves, when we give rise to animal motion, or apply our limbs to their proper use and office That their motion follows the command of the will, is a matter of common experience, like other natural events but the power or energy by which this is effected, like that in other natural events, is unknown and inconceivable *

Shall we then assert, that we are conscious of a power or energy in our own minds, when, by an act or command of our will, we raise up a new idea, fix the mind to the contemplation of it, turn it on all sides, and at last dismiss it for some other idea, when we think that we have surveyed it with sufficient accuracy? I believe the same arguments will prove, that even this command of the will gives us no real idea of force or energy

I It must be allowed, that, when we know a power, we know that very circumstance in the cause, by which it is enabled to produce the effect for these are supposed to be synonymous We must, therefore, know both the cause and effect, and the relation between them But do we pretend to be acquainted with the nature of the human soul and the nature of an idea, or the aptitude of the one to produce the other? This is a real creation, a production of something out of nothing which implies a power so great, that it may seem, at first sight, beyond the reach of any being less than infinite At least it must be owned, that such a power is not felt, nor known, nor even conceivable by the mind We only feel the event, namely, the existence of an idea, consequent to a command of the will but the manner, in which this operation is performed, the power by which it is produced, is entirely beyond our comprehension

II The command of the mind over itself is limited, as well as its command over the body and these limits are not known by reason, or any acquaintance with the nature of cause and effect,

* It may be pretended, that the resistance which we meet with in bodies obliging us frequently to exert our force, and call up all our power this gives us the idea of force and power It is this *nisus* or strong endeavour, of which we are conscious, that is the original impression from which this idea is copied But, *first*, we attribute power to a vast number of objects, where we never can suppose this resistance or exertion of force to take place, to the Supreme Being who never meets with any resistance to the mind in its command over its ideas and limbs, in common thinking and motion, where the effect follows immediately upon the will, without any exertion or summoning up of force to inanimate matter, which is not capable of this sentiment *Secondly*, This sentiment of an endeavour to overcome resistance has no known connection with any event what follows it we know by experience, but could not know it *a priori*. It must, however, be confessed, that the animal nisus which we experience, though it can afford no accurate precise idea of power, enters very much into that vulgar, inaccurate idea, which is formed of it.

But only by experience and observation, as in all other natural events and in the operation of external objects. Our authority over our sentiments and passions is much weaker than that over our ideas, and even the latter authority is circumscribed within very narrow boundaries. Will any one pretend to assign the ultimate reason of these boundaries, or show why the power is deficient in one case, not in another?

III. This self-command is very different at different times. A man in health possesses more of it than one languishing with sickness. We are more master of our thoughts in the morning than in the evening, fasting, than after full a meal. Can we give any reason for these variations, except experience? Where then is the power of which we pretend to be conscious? Is there not here, either in a spiritual or material substance, or both, some secret mechanism or structure of parts, upon which the effect depends, and which, being entirely unknown to us, renders the power or energy of the will equally unknown and incomprehensible?

Volition is surely an act of the mind, with which we are sufficiently acquainted. Reflect upon it. Consider it on all sides. Do you find any thing in it like this creative power, by which it raises from nothing a new idea, and, with a kind of FIAT, imitates the omnipotence of its Maker, if I may be allowed so to speak, who called forth into existence all the various scenes of Nature? So far from being conscious of this energy in the will, it requires as certain experience, as that of which we are possessed, to convince us that such extraordinary effects do ever result from a simple act of volition.

The generality of mankind never find any difficulty in accounting for the more common and familiar operations of nature, such as the descent of heavy bodies, the growth of plants, the generation of animals, or the nourishment of bodies by food: but suppose, that, in all these cases, they perceive the very force or energy of the cause, by which it is connected with its effect, and is for ever infallible in its operation. They acquire, by long habit, such a turn of mind, that upon the appearance of the cause, they immediately expect with assurance its usual attendant, and hardly conceive it possible that any other event could result from it. It is only on the discovery of extraordinary phenomena, such as earthquakes, pestilence, and prodigies of any kind, that they find themselves at a loss to assign a proper cause, and to explain the manner in which the effect is produced by it. It is usual for men, in such difficulties, to have recourse to some invisible intelligent principle, [θεος απο μηχανης] as the immediate cause of that event, which surprises them, and which they think cannot be accounted for from the common powers of nature. But philosophers, who carry their scrutiny a little farther, immediately perceive, that, even in the most familiar events, the energy of the

cause is as unintelligible as in the most unusual, and that we only learn by experience the frequent conjunction of objects, without being ever able to comprehend any thing like connection between them. Here, then, many philosophers think themselves obliged by reason to have recourse, on all occasions, to the same principle, which the vulgar never appeal to but in cases that appear miraculous and supernatural. They acknowledge mind and intelligence to be, not only the ultimate and original cause of all things, but the immediate and sole cause of every event which appears in nature They pretend, that those objects, which are commonly denominated *causes*, are in reality nothing but *occasions*; and that the true and direct principle of every effect is not any power or force in nature, but a volition of the Supreme Being, who wills that such particular objects should for ever be conjoined with each other Instead of saying, that one billiard-ball moves another by a force which it has derived from the author of nature, it is the Deity himself, they say, who, by a particular volition, moves the second ball, being determined to this operation by the impulse of the first ball, in consequence of those general laws which he has laid down to himself in the government of the universe But philosophers, advancing still in their inquiries, discover, that as we are totally ignorant of the power on which depends the mutual operation of bodies, we are no less ignorant of that power on which depends the operation of mind on body, or of body on mind, nor are we able, either from our senses or consciousness, to assign the ultimate principle in one case, more than in the other The same ignorance, therefore, reduces them to the same conclusion They assert, that the Deity is the immediate cause of the union between soul and body, and that they are not the organs of sense, which, being agitated by external objects, produce sensations in the mind, but that it is a particular volition of our omnipotent Maker, which excites such a sensation in consequence of such a motion in the organ In like manner, it is not any energy in the will that produces local motion in our members it is God himself who is pleased to second our will, in itself impotent, and to command that motion, which we erroneously attribute to our own power and efficacy Nor do philosophers stop at this conclusion They sometimes extend the same inference to the mind itself in its internal operations. Our mental vision or conception of ideas is nothing but a revelation made to us by our Maker When we voluntarily turn our thoughts to any object, and raise up its image in the fancy, it is not the will which creates that idea it is the universal Creator who discovers it to the mind, and renders it present to us.

Thus, according to these philosophers, every thing is full of God. Not content with the principle, that nothing exists but by his will, that nothing possesses any power but by his concession; they rob nature, and all created beings, of every power, in order to render their de-

dependence on the Deity still more sensible and immediate. They consider not, that, by this theory, they diminish, instead of magnifying, the grandeur of those attributes, which they affect so much to celebrate. It argues, surely, more power in the Deity, to delegate a certain degree of power to inferior creatures, than to produce every thing by his own immediate volition. It argues more wisdom to contrive at first the fabric of the world with such perfect foresight, that, of itself, and by its proper operation, it may serve all the purposes of Providence, than if the great Creator were obliged every moment to adjust its parts, and animate by his breath all the wheels of that stupendous machine.

But if we would have a more philosophical confutation of this theory, perhaps the two following reflections may suffice.

I. It seems to me, that this theory of the universal energy and operation of the Supreme Being is too bold ever to carry conviction with it to a man sufficiently apprized of the weakness of human reason, and the narrow limits to which it is confined in all its operations. Though the chain of arguments which conduct to it were ever so logical, there must arise a strong suspicion, if not an absolute assurance, that it has carried us quite beyond the reach of our faculties, when it leads to conclusions so extraordinary, and so remote from common life and experience. We are got into fairy land long ere we have reached the last steps of our theory; and *there* we have no reason to trust our common methods of argument, or to think that our usual analogies and probabilities have any authority. Our line is too short to fathom such immense abysses. And however we may flatter ourselves, that we are guided, in every step which we take, by a kind of verisimilitude and experience; we may be assured that this fancied experience has no authority, when we thus apply it to subjects that lie entirely out of the sphere of experience. But on this we shall have occasion to touch afterwards. [Section XII.]

II. I cannot perceive any force in the arguments on which this theory is founded. We are ignorant, it is true, of the manner in which bodies operate on each other. Their force or energy is entirely incomprehensible: but are we not equally ignorant of the manner or force by which a mind, even the Supreme Mind, operates, either on itself or on the body? Whence, I beseech you, do we acquire any idea of it? We have no sentiment or consciousness of this power in ourselves. We have no idea of the Supreme Being but what we learn from reflection on our own faculties. Were our ignorance, therefore, a good reason for rejecting any thing, we should be led into that principle of denying all energy in the Supreme Being, as much as in the grossest matter. We surely comprehend as little the operations of one as of the other. Is it more difficult to conceive, that motion may arise from

impulse, than that it may arise from volition? All we know is our profound ignorance in both cases.*

PART II.—But to hasten to a conclusion of this argument, which is already drawn out to too great a length: we have sought in vain for an idea of power or necessary connection, in all the sources from which we could suppose it to be derived. It appears, that, in single instances of the operation of bodies, we never can, by our utmost scrutiny, discover any thing but one event following another; without being able to comprehend any force or power by which the cause operates, or any connection between it and its supposed effect. The same difficulty occurs in contemplating the operations of mind on body; where we observe the motion of the latter to follow upon the volition of the former: but are not able to observe or conceive the tye, which binds together the motion and volition, or the energy by which the mind produces this effect. The authority of the will over its own faculties and ideas is not a whit more comprehensible: so that, upon the whole, there appears not, throughout all nature, any one instance of connection, which is conceivable by us. All events seem entirely loose and separate. One event follows another, but we never can observe any tye between them. They seem *conjoined*, but never *connected*. But as we can have no idea of anything, which never appeared to our outward sense or inward sentiment, the necessary conclusion *seems* to be, that we have no idea of connection or power at all, and that these words are absolutely without any meaning, when employed either in philosophical reasonings, or common life.

But there still remains one method of avoiding this conclusion, and one source which we have not yet examined. When any natural object or event is presented, it is impossible for us, by any sagacity or penetration, to discover, or even conjecture, without experience, what event will result from it, or to carry our foresight beyond that object, which is immediately present to the memory and senses. Even after one instance or experiment, where we have observed a particular event

* I need not examine at length the *vis inertiae* which is so much talked of in the new philosophy, and which is ascribed to matter. We find by experience, that a body at rest or in motion continues for ever in its present state, till put from it by some new cause; and that a body impelled takes as much motion from the impelling body as it acquires itself. These are facts. When we call this a *vis inertiae*, we only mark these facts, without pretending to have any idea of the inert power; in the same manner as, when we talk of gravity, we mean certain effects, without comprehending that active power. It was never the meaning of Sir Isaac Newton to rob second causes of all force or energy; though some of his followers have endeavoured to establish that theory upon his authority. On the contrary, that great philosopher had recourse to an ethereal active fluid to explain his universal attraction; though he was so cautious and modest as to allow that it was a mere hypothesis not to be insisted on, without more experiments. I must confess, that there is something in the fate of opinions a little extraordinary. Des Cartes insinuated that doctrine of the universal and sole efficacy of the Deity, without insisting on it. Malebranche and other Cartesians made it the foundation of all their philosophy. It had, however, no authority in England. Locke, Clarke, and Cudworth, never so much as take notice of it, but suppose all along, that matter has a real, though subordinate and derived power. By what means has it become so prevalent among our modern metaphysicians?

to follow upon another, we are not entitled to form a general rule, or fortel what will happen in like cases; it being justly esteemed an unpardonable temerity to judge of the whole course of nature from one single experiment, however accurate or certain But when one particular species of event has always, in all instances, been conjoined with another, we make no longer any scruple of fortelling one upon the appearance of the other, and of employing that reasoning, which can alone assure us of any matter of fact or existence. We then call the one object, *Cause*, the other *Effect* We suppose, that there is some connection between them, some power in the one, by which it infallibly produces the other, and operates with the greatest certainty and strongest necessity.

It appears then, that this idea of a necessary connection among events arises from a number of similar instances, which occur, of the constant conjunction of these events, nor can that idea ever be suggested by any one of these instances, surveyed in all possible lights and positions. But there is nothing in a number of instances, different from every single instance, which is supposed to be exactly similar, except only, that after a repetition of similar instances, the mind is carried by habit, upon the appearance of one event, to expect its usual attendant, and to believe, that it will exist This connection, therefore, which we *feel* in the mind, this customary transition of the imagination from one object to its usual attendant, is the sentiment or impression, from which we form the idea of power or necessary connection. Nothing farther is in the case. Contemplate the subject on all sides, you will never find any other origin of that idea. This is the sole difference between one instance, from which we can never receive the idea of connection, and a number of similar instances, by which it is suggested. The first time a man saw the communication of motion by impulse, as by the shock of two billiard-balls, he could not pronounce that the one event was *connected*, but only that it was *conjoined* with the other After he has observed several instances of this nature, he then pronounces them to be *connected* What alteration has happened to give rise to this new idea of *connection?* Nothing but that he now *feels* these events to be *connected* in his imagination, and can readily foretel the existence of one from the appearance of the other When we say, therefore, that one object is connected with another, we mean only that they have acquired a connection in our thought, and give rise to this inference, by which they become proofs of each other's existence. a conclusion which is somewhat extraordinary, but which seems founded on sufficient evidence. Nor will its evidence be weakened by any general diffidence of the understanding, or sceptical suspicion concerning every conclusion which is new and extraordinary. No conclusions can be more agreeable to scepticism than such as make

discoveries concerning the weakness and narrow limits of human reason and capacity.

And what stronger instance can be produced of the surprising ignorance and weakness of the understanding, than the present? For surely, if there be any relation among objects, which it imports us to know perfectly, it is that of cause and effect On this are founded all our reasonings concerning matter of fact or existence By means of it alone we attain any assurance concerning objects which are removed from the present testimony of our memory and senses. The only immediate utility of all sciences is to teach us how to control and regulate future events by their causes. Our thoughts and inquiries are, therefore, every moment employed about this relation yet so imperfect are the ideas which we form concerning it, that it is impossible to give any just definition of cause, except what is drawn from something extraneous and foreign to it Similar objects are always conjoined with similar Of this we have experience Suitably to this experience, therefore, we may define a cause to be *an object, followed by another, and where all the objects, similar to the first, are followed by objects similar to the second* Or, in other words, *where, if the first had not been, the second never had existed* The appearance of a cause always conveys the mind, by a customary transition, to the idea of the effect. Of this also we have experience We may, therefore, suitably to this experience, form another definition of cause, and call it, *an object followed by another, and whose appearance always conveys the thought to that other* But though both these definitions be drawn from circumstances foreign to the cause, we cannot remedy this inconvenience, or attain any more perfect definition, which may point out that circumstance in the cause which gives it a connection with its effect. We have no idea of this connection, nor even any distinct notion what it is we desire to know, when we endeavour at a conception of it. We say, for instance, that the vibration of this string is the cause of this particular sound. But what do we mean by that affirmation? We either mean, *that this vibration is followed by this sound, and that all similar vibrations have been followed by similar sounds*, or, *that this vibration is followed by this sound, and that upon the appearance of one, the mind anticipates the senses, and forms immediately an idea of the other* We may consider the relation of cause and effect in either of these two lights, but beyond these, we have no idea of it *

* According to these explications and definitions, the idea of *power* is relative as much as that of *cause*, and both have a reference to an effect, or some other event constantly conjoined with the former When we consider the *unknown* circumstance of an object, by which the degree or quantity of its effect is fixed and determined, we call that its power. And accordingly, it is allowed by all philosophers, that the effect is the measure of the power. But if they had any idea of power as it is in itself, why could not they measure it in itself? The dispute, whether the force of a body in motion be as its velocity, or the square of its velocity

To recapitulate, therefore, the reasonings of this section: every idea is copied from some preceding impression or sentiment, and where we cannot find any impression, we may be certain there is no idea. In all single instances of the operation of bodies or minds, there is nothing that produces any impression, nor consequently can suggest any idea, of power or necessary connection. But when many uniform instances appear, and the same object is always followed by the same event, we then begin to entertain the notion of cause and connection. We then *feel* a new sentiment or impression, to wit, a customary connection in the thought or imagination between one object and its usual attendant, and this sentiment is the original of that idea which we seek for. For as this idea arises from a number of similar instances, and not from any single instance, it must arise from that circumstance, in which the number of instances differ from every individual instance. But this customary connection or transition of the imagination is the only circumstance in which they differ. In every other particular they are alike. The first instance which we saw of motion, communicated by the shock of two billiard-balls (to return to this obvious illustration) is exactly similar to any instance that may, at present, occur to us, except only, that we could not, at first, *infer* one event from the other, which we are enabled to do at present, after so long a course of uniform experience. I know not, whether the reader will readily apprehend this reasoning. I am afraid, that, should I multiply words about it, or throw it into a greater variety of lights, it would only become more obscure and intricate. In all abstract reasonings, there is one point of view, which, if we can happily hit, we shall go farther towards illustrating the subject, than by all the eloquence and copious expression in the world. This point of view we should endeavour to reach, and reserve the flowers of rhetoric for subjects which are more adapted to them.

this dispute, I say, needed not be decided by comparing its effects in equal or unequal times, but by a direct mensuration and comparison.

As to the frequent use of the words, Force, Power, Energy, &c., which every where occur in common conversation, as well as in philosophy; that is no proof that we are acquainted, in any instance, with the connecting principle between cause and effect, or can account ultimately for the production of one thing by another. These words, as commonly used, have very loose meanings annexed to them, and their ideas are very uncertain and confused. No animal can put external bodies in motion without the sentiment of a *nisus* or endeavour; and every animal has a sentiment or feeling from the stroke or blow of an external object that is in motion. These sensations, which are *merely animal*, and from which we can *a priori* draw no inference, we are apt to transfer to inanimate objects, and to suppose that they have some such feelings, whenever they transfer or receive motion. With regard to energies, which are exerted, without our annexing to them any idea of communicated motion, we consider only the constant experienced conjunction of the events; and as we *feel* a customary connection between the ideas, we transfer that feeling to the objects; as nothing is more usual than to apply to external bodies every internal sensation which they occasion.

SECTION VIII.—OF LIBERTY AND NECESSITY.

PART I.—It might reasonably be expected, in questions, which have been canvassed and disputed with great eagerness, since the first origin of science and philosophy, that the meaning of all the terms, at least, should have been agreed upon among the disputants; and our inquiries, in the course of two thousand years, been able to pass from words to the true and real subject of the controversy. For how easy may it seem to give exact definitions of the terms employed in reasoning and make these definitions, not the mere sound of words, the object of future scrutiny and examination? But if we consider the matter more narrowly, we shall be apt to draw a quite opposite conclusion. From this circumstance alone, that a controversy has been long kept on foot, and remains still undecided, we may presume, that there is some ambiguity in the expression, and that the disputants affix different ideas to the terms employed in the controversy. For as the faculties of the mind are supposed to be naturally alike in every individual; otherwise nothing could be more fruitless than to reason or dispute together; it were impossible, if men affix the same ideas to their terms, that they could so long form different opinions of the same subject; especially when they communicate their views, and each party turn themselves on all sides, in search of arguments, which may give them the victory over their antagonists. It is true; if men attempt the discussion of questions, which lie entirely beyond the reach of human capacity, such as those concerning the origin of worlds, or the economy of the intellectual system or region of spirits, they may long beat the air in their fruitless contests, and never arrive at any determinate conclusion. But if the question regard any subject of common life and experience; nothing, one would think, could preserve the dispute so long undecided, but some ambiguous expressions, which keep the antagonists still at a distance, and hinder them from grappling with each other.

This has been the case in the long disputed question concerning liberty and necessity; and to so remarkable a degree, that, if I be not much mistaken, we shall find that all mankind, both learned and ignorant, have always been of the same opinion with regard to this subject, and that a few intelligible definitions would immediately have put an end to the whole controversy. I own, that this dispute has been so much canvassed on all hands, and has led philosophers into such a labyrinth of obscure sophistry, that it is no wonder, if a sensible reader indulge his ease so far as to turn a deaf ear to the proposal of such a question, from which he can expect neither instruction nor en-

tertainment. But the state of the argument here proposed may, perhaps, serve to renew his attention, as it has more novelty, promises at least some decision of the controversy, and will not much disturb his ease by any intricate or obscure reasoning.

I hope, therefore, to make it appear, that all men have ever agreed in the doctrine both of necessity and of liberty, according to any reasonable sense which can be put on these terms, and that the whole controversy has hitherto turned merely upon words. We shall begin with examining the doctrine of necessity.

It is universally allowed, that matter, in all its operations, is actuated by a necessary force, and that every natural effect is so precisely determined by the energy of its cause, that no other effect, in such particular circumstances, could possibly have resulted from it. The degree and direction of every motion is, by the laws of nature, prescribed with such exactness, that a living creature may as soon arise from the shock of two bodies, as motion, in any other degree or direction than what is actually produced by it. Would we therefore, form a precise idea of *necessity*, we must consider whence that idea arises, when we apply it to the operation of bodies.

It seems evident, that, if all the scenes of nature were continually shifted in such a manner, that no two events bore any resemblance to each other, but every object was entirely new, without any similitude to whatever had been seen before, we should never, in that case, have attained the least idea of necessity, or of a connection among these objects. We might say, upon such a supposition, that one object or event has followed another, not that one was produced by the other. The relation of cause and effect must be utterly unknown to mankind. Inference and reasoning concerning the operations of nature, would, from that moment, be at an end; and the memory and senses remain the only canals by which the knowledge of any real existence could possibly have access to the mind. Our idea, therefore, of necessity and causation, arises entirely from the uniformity observable in the operations of nature, where similar objects are constantly conjoined together, and the mind is determined by custom to infer the one from the appearance of the other. These two circumstances form the whole of that necessity which we ascribe to matter. Beyond the constant *conjunction* of similar objects, and the consequent *inference* from one to the other, we have no notion of any necessity or connection.

If it appear, therefore, that all mankind have ever allowed, without any doubt or hesitation, that these two circumstances take place in the voluntary actions of men, and in the operations of mind; it must follow, that all mankind have ever agreed in the doctrine of necessity, and that they have hitherto disputed, merely for not understanding each other.

As to the first circumstance, the constant and regular conjunction of similar events, we may possibly satisfy ourselves by the following considerations. It is universally acknowledged, that there is a great uniformity among the actions of men, in all nations and ages, and that human nature remains still the same, in its principles and operations. The same motives always produce the same actions The same events follow from the same causes Ambition, avarice, self-love, vanity, friendship, generosity, public spirit, these passions, mixed in various degrees, and distributed through society, have been, from the beginning of the world, and still are, the source of all the actions and enterprises which have ever been observed among mankind. Would you know the sentiments, inclinations, and course of life of the Greeks and Romans? Study well the temper and actions of the French and English you cannot be much mistaken in transferring to the former *most* of the observations which you have made with regard to the latter Mankind are so much the same, in all times and places, that history informs us of nothing new or strange in that particular Its chief use is only to discover the constant and universal principles of human nature, by shewing men in all varieties of circumstances and situations, and furnishing us with materials, from which we may form our observations, and become acquainted with the regular springs of human action and behaviour These records of wars, intrigues, factions, and revolutions, are so many collections of experiments, by which the politician or moral philosopher fixes the principles of his science, in the same manner as the physician or natural philosopher becomes acquainted with the nature of plants, minerals, and other external objects, by the experiments which he forms concerning them. Nor are the earth, water, and other elements, examined by Aristotle and Hippocrates, more like to those which at present lie under our observation, than to the men, described by Polybius and Tacitus, are to those who now govern the world

Should a traveller, returning from a far country, bring us an account of men wholly different from any with whom we were ever acquainted; men who were entirely divested of avarice, ambition, or revenge, who knew no pleasure but friendship, generosity, and public spirit, we should immediately, from these circumstances, detect the falsehood, and prove him a liar, with the same certainty as if he had stuffed his narration with stories of centaurs and dragons, miracles, and prodigies. And if we would explode any forgery in history, we cannot make use of a more convincing argument, than to prove, that the actions, ascribed to any person, are directly contrary to the course of nature, and that no human motives, in such circumstances, could ever induce him to such a conduct. The veracity of Quintus Curtius is as much to be suspected, when he describes the supernatural courage of

Alexander, by which he was hurried on single to attack multitudes, as when he describes his supernatural force and activity, by which he was able to resist them. So readily and universally do we acknowledge a uniformity in human motives and actions, as well as in the operations of body.

Hence, likewise, the benefit of that experience, acquired by long life and a variety of business and company, in order to instruct us in the principles of human nature, and regulate our future conduct, as well as speculation By means of this guide we mount up to the knowledge of men's inclinations and motives, from their actions, expressions, and even gestures, and again descend to the interpretation of their actions, from our knowledge of their motives and inclinations. The general observations, treasured up by a course of experience, give us the clue of human nature, and teach us to unravel all its intricacies. Pretexts and appearances no longer deceive us Public declarations pass for the specious colouring of a cause And though virtue and honour be allowed their proper weight and authority, that perfect disinterestedness, so often pretended to, is never expected in multitudes and parties, seldom in their leaders, and scarcely even in individuals of any rank or station But were there no uniformity in human actions, and were every experiment, which we could form of this kind, irregular and anomalous, it were impossible to collect any general observations concerning mankind, and no experience, however accurately digested by reflection would ever serve to any purpose Why is the aged husbandman more skilful in his calling than the young beginner, but because there is a certain uniformity in the operation of the sun, rain, and earth, towards the production of vegetables, and experience teaches the old practitioner the rules, by which this operation is governed and directed?

We must not, however, expect, that this uniformity of human actions should be carried to such a length, as that all men, in the same circumstances, will always act precisely in the same manner, without making any allowance for the diversity of characters, prejudices, and opinions. Such a uniformity, in every particular, is found in no part of nature. On the contrary, from observing the variety of conduct in different men, we are enabled to form a greater variety of maxims, which suppose a degree of uniformity and regularity.

Are the manners of men different in different ages and countries? We learn thence the great force of custom and education, which mould the human mind from its infancy, and form it into a fixed and established character. Is the behaviour and conduct of the one sex very unlike that of the other? It is thence we become acquainted with the different characters which Nature has impressed upon the sexes, and which she preserves with constancy and regularity. Are the actions of the same person much diversified in the different periods

of his life, from infancy to old age? This affords room for many general observations concerning the gradual change of our sentiments and inclinations, and the different maxims which prevail in the different ages of human creatures. Even the characters, which are peculiar to each individual, have a uniformity in their influence, otherwise our acquaintance with the persons, and our observation of their conduct, could never teach us their dispositions, or serve to direct our behaviour with regard to them

I grant it possible to find some actions, which seem to have no regular connection with any known motives, and are exceptions to all the measures of conduct, which have ever been established for the government of men But if we would willingly know, what judgment should be formed of such irregular and extraordinary actions we may consider the sentiments, commonly entertained with regard to those irregular events, which appear in the course of nature, and the operation of external objects All causes are not conjoined to their usual effects, with like uniformity An artificer, who handles only dead matter, may be disappointed of his aim, as well as the politician, who directs the conduct of sensible and intelligent agents

The vulgar, who take things according to their first appearance, attribute the uncertainty of events to such an uncertainty in the causes as makes the latter often fail of their usual influence, though they meet with no impediment in their operation But philosophers, observing, that, almost in every part of nature, there is contained a vast variety of springs and principles, which are hid, by reason of their minuteness or remoteness, find, that it is at least possible the contrariety of events may not proceed from any contingency in the cause, but from the secret operation of contrary causes This possibility is converted into certainty by farther observation, when they remark, that, upon an exact scrutiny, a contrariety of effects always betrays a contrariety of causes, and proceeds from their mutual opposition A peasant can give no better reason for the stopping of any clock or watch, than to say that it does not commonly go right but an artist easily perceives, that the same force in the spring or pendulum has always the same influence on the wheels, but fails of its usual effect, perhaps, by reason of a grain of dust, which puts a stop to the whole movement. From the observation of several parallel instances, philosophers form a maxim, that the connection between all causes and effects is equally necessary, and that its seeming uncertainty in some instances proceeds from the secret opposition of contrary causes.

Thus, for instance, in the human body, when the usual symptoms of health or sickness disappoint our expectation; when medicines operate not with their wonted power, when irregular events follow from any particular cause. the philosopher and physician are not surprised at the matter, nor are ever tempted to deny, in general, the

necessity and uniformity of those principles by which the animal economy is conducted. They know that a human body is a mighty complicated machine: that many secret powers lurk in it, which are altogether beyond our comprehension: that to us it must often appear very uncertain in its operations: and that therefore the irregular events, which outwardly discover themselves, can be no proof, that the laws of Nature are not observed with the greatest regularity in its internal operations and government.

The philosopher, if he be consistent, must apply the same reasoning to the actions and volitions of intelligent agents. The most irregular and unexpected resolutions of men may frequently be accounted for by those who know every particular circumstance of their character and situation. A person of an obliging disposition gives a peevish answer: but he has the tooth-ache, or has not dined. A stupid fellow discovers an uncommon alacrity in his carriage: but he has met with a sudden piece of good fortune. Or even when an action, as sometimes happens, cannot be particularly accounted for, either by the person himself or by others; we know, in general, that the characters of men are, to a certain degree, inconstant and irregular. This is, in a manner, the constant character of human nature; though it be applicable, in a more particular manner, to some persons who have no fixed rule for their conduct, but proceed in a continued course of caprice and inconstancy. The internal principles and motives may operate in a uniform manner, notwithstanding these seeming irregularities; in the same manner as the winds, rain, clouds, and other variations of the weather, are supposed to be governed by steady principles, though not easily discoverable by human sagacity and inquiry.

Thus it appears, not only that the conjunction between motives and voluntary actions is as regular and uniform, as that between the cause and effect in any part of Nature; but also that this regular conjunction has been universally acknowledged among mankind, and has never been the subject of dispute, either in philosophy or common life. Now, as it is from past experience, that we draw all inferences concerning the future, and as we conclude that objects will always be conjoined together, which we find to have always been conjoined; it may seem superfluous to prove, that this experienced uniformity in human actions is a source, whence we draw *inferences* concerning them. But in order to throw the argument into a greater variety of lights, we shall also insist, though briefly, on this latter topic.

The mutual dependence of men is so great, in all societies, that scarce any human action is entirely complete in itself, or is performed without some reference to the actions of others, which are requisite to make it answer fully the intention of the agent. The poorest artificer who labours alone, expects at least the protection of the magistrate, to ensure him the enjoyment of the fruits of his labour. He also expects, that when he carries his goods to market, and offers them at a reason-

able price, he shall find purchasers; and shall be able, by the money he acquires, to engage others to supply him with those commodities, which are requisite for his subsistence In proportion as men extend their dealings, and render their intercourse with others more complicated, they always comprehend, in their schemes of life, a greater variety of voluntary actions, which they expect, from the proper motives, to co-operate with their own In all these conclusions, they take their measures from past experience, in the same manner as in their reasonings concerning external objects, and firmly believe, that men, as well as all the elements, are to continue in their operations, the same, that they have ever found them. A manufacturer reckons upon the labour of his servants, for the execution of any work, as much as upon the tools which he employs, and would be equally surprised were his expectations disappointed In short, this experimental inference and reasoning concerning the actions of others enters so much into human life, that no man, while awake, is ever a moment without employing it Have we not reason, therefore, to affirm that all mankind have always agreed in the doctrine of necessity, according to the foregoing definition and explication of it?

Nor have philosophers ever entertained a different opinion from the people in this particular For not to mention, that almost every action of their life supposes that opinion, there are even few of the speculative parts of learning, to which it is not essential What would become of *history*, had we not a dependence on the veracity of the historian, according to the experience which we have had of mankind? How could *politics* be a science, if laws and forms of government had not a uniform influence upon society? Where would be the foundation of *morals*, if particular characters had no certain or determinative power to produce particular sentiments, and if these sentiments had no constant operation on actions? And with what pretence could we employ our *criticism* upon any poet or polite author, if we could not pronounce the conduct and sentiments of his actors, either natural or unnatural, to such characters, and in such circumstances? It seems almost impossible, therefore, to engage either in science or action of any kind, without acknowledging the doctrine of necessity, and this *inference*, from motives to voluntary actions, from characters to conduct.

And indeed, when we consider how aptly *natural* and *moral* evidence link together, and form only one chain of argument, we shall make no scruple to allow, that they are of the same nature, and derived from the same principles. A prisoner, who has neither money nor interest, discovers the impossibility of his escape, as well when he considers the obstinacy of the gaoler, as the walls and bars with which he is surrounded; and, in all attempts for his freedom, chuses rather to work upon the stone and iron of the one, than upon the inflexible nature of the other. The same prisoner, when conducted to the scaf-

fold, foresees his death as certainly from the constancy and fidelity of his guards, as from the operation of the axe or wheel. His mind runs along a certain train of ideas the refusal of the soldiers to consent to his escape, the action of the executioner, the separation of the head and body, bleeding, convulsive motions, and death Here is a connected chain of natural causes and voluntary actions, but the mind feels no difference between them, in passing from one link to another nor is less certain of the future event than if it were connected with the objects present to the memory or senses, by a train of causes, cemented together by what we are pleased to call a *physical* necessity The same experienced union has the same effect on the mind, whether the united objects be motives, volition, and actions or figure and motion. We may change the names of things, but their nature and their operation on the understanding never change.

Were a man, whom I know to be honest and opulent, and with whom I lived in intimate friendship, to come into my house, where I am surrounded with my servants, I rest assured, that he is not to stab me before he leaves it, in order to rob me of my silver standish, and I no more suspect this event than the falling of the house itself, which is new, and solidly built and founded *But he may have been seized with a sudden and unknown frenzy* So may a sudden earthquake arise, and shake and tumble my house about my ears I shall therefore change the suppositions I shall say, that I know with certainty that he is not to put his hand into the fire, and hold it there, till it be consumed and this event, I think I can foretel with the same assurance, as that, if he throw himself out of the window, and meet with no obstruction, he will not remain a moment suspended in the air. No suspicion of an unknown frenzy can give the least possibility to the former event, which is so contrary to all the known principles of human nature. A man who at noon leaves his purse full of gold on the pavement at Charing-Cross, may as well expect that it will fly away like a feather, as that he will find it untouched an hour after Above one half of human reasonings contain inferences of a similar nature, attended with more or less degrees of certainty, proportioned to our experience of the usual conduct of mankind in such particular situations.

I have frequently considered, what could possibly be the reason, why all mankind, though they have ever, without hesitation, acknowledged the doctrine of necessity, in their whole practice and reasoning, have yet discovered such a reluctance to acknowledge it in words, and have rather shown a propensity, in all ages, to profess the contrary opinion. The matter, I think, may be accounted for after the following manner. If we examine the operations of body, and the production of effects from their causes, we shall find, that all our [illegible] can never carry us further in our knowledge of this [illegible]

than barely to observe, that particular objects are *constantly conjoined* together, and that the mind is carried, by a *customary transition*, from the appearance of one to the belief of the other. But though this conclusion concerning human ignorance be the result of the strictest scrutiny of this subject, men still entertain a strong propensity to believe, that they penetrate farther into the powers of nature, and perceive something like a necessary connection between the cause and the effect. When again they turn their reflections towards the operations of their own minds, and *feel* no such connection of the motive and the action, they are thence apt to suppose, that there is a difference between the effects, which result from material force, and those which arise from thought and intelligence. But being once convinced, that we know nothing farther of causation of any kind, than merely the *constant conjunction* of objects, and the consequent *inference* of the mind from one to another, and finding that these two circumstances are universally allowed to have place in voluntary actions, we may be more easily led to own the same necessity common to all causes. And though this reasoning may contradict the systems of many philosophers, in ascribing necessity to the determinations of the will, we shall find, upon reflection, that they dissent from it in words only, not in their real sentiments. Necessity, according to the sense in which it is here taken, has never yet been rejected nor can ever, I think, be rejected by any philosopher. It may only, perhaps, be pretended, that the mind can perceive, in the operations of matter, some farther connection between the cause and effect, and a connection that has not place in the voluntary actions of intelligent beings. Now whether it be so or not, can only appear upon examination, and it is incumbent on these philosophers to make good their assertion, by defining or describing that necessity, and pointing it out to us in the operations of material causes.

It would seem, indeed, that men begin at the wrong end of this question concerning liberty and necessity, when they enter upon it by examining the faculties of the soul, the influence of the understanding, and the operations of the will. Let them first discuss a more simple question, namely, the operations of body and of brute unintelligent matter, and try whether they can there form any idea of causation and necessity, except that of a constant conjunction of objects, and subsequent inference of the mind from one to another. If these circumstances form, in reality, the whole of that necessity which we conceive in matter, and if these circumstances be also universally acknowledged to take place in the operations of the mind, the dispute is at an end, at least, must be owned to be thenceforth merely verbal. But as long as we will rashly suppose, that we have some farther idea of necessity and causation in the operations of external objects, at the same time, that we can find nothing farther, in the voluntary ac-

tions of the mind: there is no possibility of bringing the question to any determinate issue, while we proceed upon so erroneous a supposition. The only method of undeceiving us, is to mount up higher, to examine the narrow extent of science when applied to material causes, and to convince ourselves, that all we know of them, is the constant conjunction and inference above mentioned. We may, perhaps, find that it is with difficulty we are induced to fix such narrow limits to human understanding: but we can afterwards find no difficulty when we come to apply this doctrine to the actions of the will. For as it is evident that these have a regular conjunction with motives and circumstances and character, and as we always draw inferences from one to the other, we must be obliged to acknowledge in words, that necessity which we have already avowed in every deliberation of our lives, and in every step of our conduct and behaviour.*

But to proceed in this reconciling project with regard to the question of liberty and necessity, the most contentious question of metaphysics, the most contentious science; it will not require many words to prove, that all mankind have ever agreed in the doctrine of liberty as well as in that of necessity, and that the whole dispute, in this respect also has been hitherto merely verbal. For what is meant by liberty, when applied to voluntary actions? We cannot surely mean, that actions have so little connection with motives, inclinations, and circumstances, that one does not follow with a certain degree of uniformity from the other, and that one affords no inference by which we can conclude the existence of the other. For these are plain and acknowledged matters of fact. By liberty, then, we can only mean *a power of acting or not acting according to the determinations of the will*; that is, if we choose to remain at rest, we may; if we choose to move, we also

* The prevalence of the doctrine of liberty may be accounted for from another cause, viz. a false sensation, or seeming experience which we have, or may have, of liberty or indifference, in many of our actions. The necessity of any action, whether of matter or of mind, is not, properly speaking, a quality in the agent, but in any thinking or intelligent being, who may consider the action; and it consists chiefly in the determination of his thoughts to infer the existence of that action from some preceding objects: as liberty, when opposed to necessity, is nothing but the want of that determination, and a certain looseness or indifference, which we feel, in passing, or not passing, from the idea of one object to that of any succeeding one. Now we may observe, that though, in *reflecting* on human actions, we seldom feel such a looseness or indifference, but are commonly able to infer them with considerable certainty from their motives, and from the dispositions of the agent; yet it frequently happens, that in *performing* the actions themselves, we are sensible of something like it: and as all resembling objects are readily taken for each other, this has been employed as a demonstrative and even intuitive proof of human liberty. We feel that our actions are subject to our will on most occasions, and imagine we feel, that the will itself is subject to nothing, because, when by a denial of it we are provoked to try, we feel that it moves easily every way, and produces an image of itself (or a *Velleity*, as it is called in the schools), even on that side on which it did not settle. This image, or faint motion, we persuade ourselves, could at that time have been completed into the thing itself; because, should that be denied, we find, upon a second trial, that at present it can. We consider not, that the fantastical desire of shewing liberty is here the motive of our actions. And it seems certain, that however we may imagine we feel a liberty within ourselves, a spectator can commonly infer our actions from our motives and character; and even where he cannot, he concludes in general, that he might, were he perfectly acquainted with every circumstance of our situation and temper, and the most secret springs of our complexion and disposition. Now this is the very essence of necessity, according to the foregoing doctrine.

may. Now this hypothetical liberty is universally allowed to belong to every one who is not a prisoner and in chains. Here then is no subject of dispute

Whatever definition we may give of liberty, we should be careful to observe two requisite circumstances I That it be consistent with plain matter of fact II That it be consistent with itself If we observe these circumstances, and render our definition intelligible, I am persuaded that all mankind will be found of one opinion with regard to it

It is universally allowed, that nothing exists without a cause of its existence, and that chance, when strictly examined, is a mere negative word, and means not any real power which has any where a being in Nature But it is pretended, that some causes are necessary, some not necessary Here then is the advantage of definitions Let any one *define* a cause, without comprehending, as a part of the definition, a *necessary connection*, with its effect, and let him shew distinctly the origin of the idea, expressed by the definition, and I shall readily give up the whole controversy But if the foregoing explication of the matter be received, this must be absolutely impracticable Had not objects a regular conjunction with each other, we should never have entertained any notion of cause and effect, and this regular conjunction produces that inference of the understanding, which is the only connection that we can have any comprehension of Whoever attempts a definition of cause, exclusive of these circumstances, will be obliged, either to employ unintelligible terms, or such as are synonymous to the term which he endeavours to define * And if the definition above mentioned be admitted, liberty, when opposed to necessity, not to constraint, is the same thing with chance, which is universally allowed to have no existence

PART II —THERE is no method of reasoning more common, and yet none more blameable, than, in philosophical disputes, to endeavour the refutation of any hypothesis, by a pretence of its dangerous consequences to religion and morality When any opinion leads to absurdity, it is certainly false, but it is not certain that an opinion is false, because it is of dangerous consequence. Such topics, therefore, ought entirely to be forborne, as serving nothing to the discovery of truth, but only to make the person of an antagonist odious. This I observe in general, without pretending to draw any advantage from it. I frankly submit to an examination of this kind, and shall venture

* Thus, if a cause be defined, *that which produces any thing*, it is easy to observe, that *producing* is synonymous to *causing* In like manner, if a cause be defined, *that by which any thing exists*, this is liable to the same objection. For what is meant by these words, *by which?* Had it been said, that a cause is *that* after which *any thing constantly exists*, we should have understood the terms. For this is, indeed, all we know of the matter. And this constancy forms the very essence of necessity, nor have we any other idea of it.

to affirm, that the doctrines, both of necessity and of liberty, as above explained, are not only consistent with morality, but are absolutely essential to its support.

Necessity may be defined two ways, conformably to the two definitions of *cause*, of which it makes an essential part. It consists either in the constant conjunction of like objects, or in the inference of the understanding from one object to another. Now necessity, in both these senses, (which, indeed, are at bottom the same), has universally, though tacitly, in the schools, in the pulpit, and in common life, been allowed to belong to the will of man; and no one has ever pretended to deny, that we can draw inferences concerning human actions, and that those inferences are founded on the experienced union of like actions, with like motives, inclinations, and circumstances. The only particular, in which any one can differ, is, that either, perhaps, he will refuse to give the name of necessity to this property of human actions; but as long as the meaning is understood, I hope the word can do no harm: or, that he will maintain it possible to discover something farther in the operations of matter. But this, it must be acknowledged, can be of no consequence to morality or religion, whatever it may be to natural philosophy or metaphysics. We may here be mistaken in asserting, that there is no idea of any other necessity or connection in the actions of body: but surely we ascribe nothing to the actions of the mind, but what every one does, and must readily allow of. We change no circumstance in the received orthodox system with regard to the will, but only in that with regard to material objects and causes. Nothing therefore can be more innocent, at least, than this doctrine.

All laws being founded on rewards and punishments, it is supposed, as a fundamental principle, that these motives have a regular and uniform influence on the mind, and both produce the good, and prevent the evil actions. We may give to this influence what name we please; but as it is usually conjoined with the action, it must be esteemed a *cause*, and be looked upon as an instance of that necessity which we would here establish.

The only proper object of hatred or vengeance, is a person or creature, endowed with thought and consciousness; and when any criminal or injurious actions excite that passion, it is only by their relation to the person, or connection with him. Actions are, by their very nature, temporary and perishing; and where they proceed not from some *cause* in the character and disposition of the person who performed them, they can neither redound to his honour, if good; nor infamy, if evil. The actions themselves may be blameable; they may be contrary to all the rules of morality and religion: but the person is not answerable for them; and as they proceeded from nothing in him, that is durable and constant, and leave nothing of that nature behind

them, it is impossible he can, upon their account, become the object of punishment or vengeance. According to the principle, therefore, which denies necessity, and consequently causes, a man is as pure and untainted, after having committed the most horrid crime, as at the first moment of his birth, nor is his character any wise concerned in his actions, since they are not derived from it, and the wickedness of the one can never be used as a proof of the depravity of the other

Men are not blamed for such actions, as they perform ignorantly and casually, whatever may be the consequences Why? but because the principles of these actions are only momentary, and terminate in them alone. Men are less blamed for such actions as they perform hastily and unpremeditately, than for such as proceed from deliberation. For what reason? but because a hasty temper, though a constant cause or principle in the mind, operates only by intervals, and infects not the whole character Again, repentance wipes off every crime, if attended with a reformation of life and manners How is this to be accounted for? but by asserting, that actions render a person criminal, merely as they are proofs of criminal principles in the mind, and when, by an alteration of these principles, they cease to be just proofs, they likewise cease to be criminal. But, except upon the doctrine of necessity, they never were just proofs, and consequently never were criminal

It will be equally easy to prove, and from the same arguments, that *liberty*, according to that definition above-mentioned, in which all men agree, is also essential to morality, and that no human actions, where it is wanting, are susceptible of any moral qualities, nor can be the objects either of approbation or dislike For as actions are objects of our moral sentiment, so far only as they are indications of the internal character, passions, and affections, it is impossible that they can give rise either to praise or blame, where they proceed not from these principles, but are derived altogether from external objects

I pretend not to have obviated or removed all objections to this theory, with regard to necessity and liberty I can foresee other objections, derived from topics, which have not here been treated of. It may be said, for instance, that, if voluntary actions be subjected to the same laws of necessity with the operations of matter, there is a continued chain of necessary causes, pre-ordained, and pre-determined, reaching from the Original Cause of all, to every single volition of every human creature. No contingency anywhere in the universe, no indifference; no liberty While we act, we are, at the same time, acted upon. The ultimate Author of all our volitions is the Creator of the world, who first bestowed motion on this immense machine, and placed all beings in that particular position, whence every subsequent event, by an inevitable necessity, must result. Human actions, therefore, either can have no moral turpitude at all, as proceeding from so good a cause, or if they have any turpitude, they must involve our

Creator in the same guilt, while he is acknowledged to be their ultimate cause and author For as a man, who fired a mine, is answerable for all the consequences, whether the train he employed be long or short; so, wherever a continued chain of necessary causes is fixed, that Being, either finite or infinite, who produces the first, is likewise the author of all the rest, and must both bear the blame, and acquire the praise, which belong to them Our clear and unalterable ideas of morality establish this rule, upon unquestionable reasons, when we examine the consequences of any human action, and these reasons must still have greater force, when applied to the volitions and intentions of a Being, infinitely wise and powerful. Ignorance or impotence may be pleaded for so limited a creature as man, but those imperfections have no place in our Creator He foresaw, he ordained, he intended all those actions of men, which we so rashly pronounce criminal. And we must therefore conclude, either that they are not criminal, or that the Deity, not man, is accountable for them. But as either of these positions is absurd and impious, it follows that the doctrine, from which they are deduced, cannot possibly be true, as being liable to all the same objections An absurd consequence, if necessary, proves the original doctrine to be absurd, in the same manner as criminal actions render criminal the original cause, if the connection between them be necessary and inevitable

This objection consists of two parts, which we shall examine separately I that if human actions can be traced up, by a necessary chain, to the Deity, they can never be criminal, on account of the infinite perfection of that Being, from whom they are derived, and who can intend nothing but what is altogether good and laudable Or, II, if they be criminal, we must retract the attribute of perfection, which we ascribe to the Deity, and must acknowledge him to be the ultimate author of guilt and moral turpitude in all his creatures

The answer to the first objection seems obvious and convincing There are many philosophers, who, after an exact scrutiny of all the phenomena of Nature, conclude that the WHOLE, considered as one system, is, in every period of its existence, ordered with perfect benevolence, and that the utmost possible happiness will, in the end, result to all created beings, without any mixture of positive or absolute ill and misery Every physical ill, say they, makes an essential part of this benevolent system and could not possibly be removed, even by the Deity himself, considered as a wise agent, without giving entrance to greater ill, or excluding greater good, which will result from it. From this theory, some philosophers, and the ancient *Stoics* among the rests, derived a topic of consolation under all afflictions, while they taught their pupils, that those ills, under which they laboured, were, in reality, goods to the universe; and that to an enlarged view which could comprehend the whole system of Nature,

every event became an object of joy and exultation. But though this topic be specious and sublime, it was soon found in practice weak and ineffectual. You would surely more irritate than appease a man lying under the racking pains of gout, by preaching up to him the rectitude of those general laws which produced the malignant humours in his body, and led them through the proper canals, to the sinews and nerves, where they now excite such acute torments. These enlarged views may, for a moment, please the imagination of a speculative man, who is placed in ease and security; but neither can they dwell with constancy on his mind even though undisturbed by the emotions of pain or passion; much less can they maintain their ground when attacked by such powerful antagonists. The affections take a narrower and more natural survey of their object; and by an economy, more suitable to the infirmity of human minds, regard alone the beings around us, and are actuated by such events as appear good or ill to the private system.

The case is the same with *moral* as with *physical* ill. It cannot reasonably be supposed, that those remote considerations, which are found of so little efficacy with regard to one, will have a more powerful influence with regard to the other. The mind of man is so formed by Nature, that upon the appearance of certain characters, dispositions, and actions, it immediately feels the sentiment of approbation or blame; nor are there any emotions more essential to its frame and constitution. The characters which engage our approbation, are chiefly such as contribute to the peace and security of human society; as the characters which excite blame, are chiefly such as tend to public detriment and disturbance: whence it may reasonably be presumed, that the moral sentiments arise, either mediately or immediately, from a reflection on these opposite interests. What though philosophical meditations establish a different opinion or conjecture, that every thing is right with regard to the whole, and that the qualities which disturb society are, in the main, as beneficial, and are as suitable to the primary intention of Nature, as those which more directly promote its happiness and welfare? Are such remote and uncertain speculations able to counterbalance the sentiments which arise from the natural and immediate view of the objects? A man who is robbed of a considerable sum; does he find his vexation for the loss any wise diminished by these sublime reflections? Why, then, should his moral resentment against the crime be supposed incompatible with them? Or why should not the acknowledgment of a real distinction between vice and virtue be reconcilable to all speculative systems of philosophy, as well as that of a real distinction between personal beauty and deformity? Both these distinctions are founded in the natural sentiments of the human mind: and these sentiments are not to

be controuled or altered by any philosophical theory or any speculation whatsoever.

The *second* objection admits not of so easy and satisfactory an answer; nor is it possible to explain distinctly, how the Deity can be the immediate cause of all the actions of men, without being the author of sin and moral turpitude These are mysteries, which mere natural and unassisted reason is very unfit to handle and whatever system she embraces, she must find herself involved in inextricable difficulties, and even contradictions, at every step which she takes with regard to such objects To reconcile the indifference and contingency of human actions with prescience, or to defend absolute decrees, and yet free the Deity from being the author of sin, has been found hitherto to exceed all the power of philosophy Happy, if she be thence sensible of her temerity, when she pries into these sublime mysteries, and, leaving a scene so full of obscurities and perplexities, return, with suitable modesty, to her true and proper province, the examination of common life, where she will find difficulties enow to employ her inquiries, without launching into so boundless an ocean, of doubt, uncertainty, and contradiction

---

SECTION IX —OF THE REASON OF ANIMALS.

ALL our reasonings concerning matter of fact are founded on a species of ANALOGY, which leads us to expect from any cause the same events which we have observed to result from similar causes Where the causes are entirely similar, the analogy is perfect, and the inference drawn from it is regarded as certain and conclusive nor does any man ever entertain a doubt, where he sees a piece of iron, that it will have weight and cohesion of parts, as in all other instances which have ever fallen under his observation But where the objects have not so exact a similarity, the analogy is less perfect, and the inference is less conclusive, though still it has some force, in proportion to the degree of similarity and resemblance The anatomical observations, formed upon one animal, are, by this species of reasoning, extended to all animals, and it is certain, that, when the circulation of the blood, for instance, is clearly proved to have place in one creature, as a frog, or fish, it forms a strong presumption that the same principle has place in all These analogical observations may be carried further, even to this science, of which we are now treating, and any theory, by which we explain the operations of the understanding, or the origin and connection of the passions in man, will acquire

additional authority if we find that the same theory is requisite to explain the same phenomena in all other animals. We shall make trial of this, with regard to the hypothesis by which we have, in the foregoing discourse, endeavoured to account for all experimental reasonings; and it is hoped that this new point of view will serve to confirm all our former observations.

I. It seems evident, that animals, as well as men, learn many things from experience, and infer that the same events will always follow from the same causes. By this principle they become acquainted with the more obvious properties of external objects, and gradually, from their birth, treasure up a knowledge of the nature of fire, water, earth, stones, heights, depths, &c., and of the effects which result from their operation. The ignorance and inexperience of the young, are here plainly distinguishable from the cunning and sagacity of the old, who have learned, by long observation, to avoid what hurt them, and to pursue what gave ease or pleasure. A horse, that has been accustomed to the field, becomes acquainted with the proper height which he can leap, and will never attempt what exceeds his force and ability. An old greyhound will trust the more fatiguing part of the chace to the younger, and will place himself so as to meet the hare in her doubles; nor are the conjectures which he forms on this occasion, founded in any thing but his observation and experience.

This is still more evident from the effects of discipline and education on animals, who, by the proper application of rewards and punishments, may be taught any course of action, the most contrary to their natural instincts and propensities. Is it not experience which renders a dog apprehensive of pain, when you menace him, or lift up the whip to beat him? Is it not even experience which makes him answer to his name, and infer, from such an arbitrary sound, that you mean him rather than any of his fellows, and intend to call him, when you pronounce it in a certain manner, with a certain tone and accent?

In all these cases, we may observe that the animal infers some fact beyond what immediately strikes his senses; and that this inference is altogether founded on past experience, while the creature expects, from the present object the same consequences, which it has always found in its observation to result from similar objects.

II. It is impossible that this inference of the animal can be founded on any process of argument or reasoning, by which he concludes that like events must follow like objects, and that the course of nature will always be regular in its operation. For if there be in reality any arguments of this nature, they surely lie too abstruse for the observation of such imperfect understandings; since it may well employ the utmost care and attention of a philosophic genius to discover and observe them. Animals, therefore, are not guided in these inferences by reasoning: neither are children: neither are the generality of

mankind, in their ordinary actions and conclusions neither are philosophers themselves, who, in all the active parts of life, are in the main the same with the vulgar, and are governed by the same maxims. Nature must have provided some other principle, of more ready and more general use and application, nor can an operation of such immense consequence in life as that of inferring effects from causes, be trusted to the uncertain process of reasoning and argumentation Were this doubtful with regard to men, it seems to admit of no question with regard to the brute creation, and the conclusion being once firmly established in the one, we have a strong presumption, from all the rules of analogy, that it ought to be universally admitted, without any exception or reserve It is custom alone which engages animals, from every object that strikes their senses, to infer its usual attendant, and carries their imagination, from the appearance of the one, to conceive the other in that particular manner, which we denominate *belief* No other explication can be given of this operation, in all the higher as well as lower classes of sensative beings which fall under our notice and observation *

But though animals learn many parts of their knowledge from observation, there are also many parts of it which they derive from the original hand of Nature, which much exceed the share of capacity they possess on ordinary occasions, and in which they improve, little or nothing, by the longest practice and experience These we denominate INSTINCTS, and are so apt to admire, as something very extraordinary, and inexplicable by all the disquisitions of human

* Since all reasonings concerning facts or causes is derived merely from custom it may be asked how it happens that men so much surpass animals in reasoning and one man so much surpasses another? Has not the same custom the same influence on all?

We shall here endeavour briefly to explain the great difference in human understandings after which, the reason of the difference between men and animals will easily be comprehended.

1 When we have lived any time and have been accustomed to the uniformity of nature, we acquire a general habit by which we always transfer the known to the unknown, and conceive the latter to resemble the former By means of this general habitual principle, we regard even one experiment as the foundation of reasoning and expect a similar event with some degree of certainty, where the experiment has been made accurately and free from all foreign circumstances. It is therefore considered as a matter of great importance to observe the consequences of things and as one man may very much surpass another in attention, and memory, and observation this will make a very great difference in their reasoning 2. Where there is a complication of causes to produce any effect, one mind may be much larger than another, and better able to comprehend the whole system of objects, and to infer justly their consequences. 3 One man is able to carry on a chain of consequences to a greater length than another 4. Few men can think long without running into a confusion of ideas, and mistaking one for another and there are various degrees of this infirmity 5. The circumstance, on which the effect depends, is frequently involved in other circumstances which are foreign and extrinsic. The separation of it often requires great attention, accuracy, and subtilty 6. The forming of general maxims from particular observation is a very nice operation; and nothing is more usual from haste or a narrowness of mind which sees not on all sides, than to commit mistakes in this particular 7 When we reason from analogies, the man who has the greater experience or the greater promptitude of suggesting analogies, will be the better reasoner 8. Biasses from prejudice, education, passion party &c. hang more upon one mind than another 9. After we have acquired a confidence in human testimony, books and conversation enlarge much more the sphere of one man's experience and thought than those of another

It would be easy to discover many other circumstances that make a difference in the understandings of men.

understanding. But our wonder will perhaps cease or diminish; when we consider that the experimental reasoning itself, which we possess in common with beasts, and on which the whole conduct of life depends, is nothing but a species of instinct or mechanical power, that acts in us unknown to ourselves, and in its chief operations is not directed by any such relations or comparisons of ideas, as are the proper objects of our intellectual faculties. Though the instinct be different, yet still it is an instinct, which teaches a man to avoid the fire, as much as that, which teaches a bird, with such exactness, the art of incubation, and the whole economy and order of its nursery.

SECTION XII.—OF THE ACADEMICAL OR SCEPTICAL PHILOSOPHY.

PART I.—There is not a greater number of philosophical reasonings, displayed upon any subject, than those which prove the existence of a Deity, and refute the fallacies of *Atheists*, and yet the most religious philosophers still dispute whether any man can be so blinded as to be a speculative atheist. How shall we reconcile these contradictions? The knight-errants, who wandered about to clear the world of dragons and of giants, never entertained the least doubt with regard to the existence of these monsters.

The *Sceptic* is another enemy of religion, who naturally provokes the indignation of all divines and graver philosophers, though it is certain that no man ever met with any such absurd creature, or conversed with a man who had no opinion or principle concerning any subject, either of action or speculation. This begets a very natural question. What is meant by a sceptic, and how far it is possible to push these philosophical principles of doubt and uncertainty?

There is a species of scepticism, *antecedent* to all study and philosophy, which is much inculcated by Des Cartes and others, as a sovereign preservative against error and precipitate judgment. It recommends an universal doubt, not only of all our former opinions and principles, but also of our very faculties; of whose veracity, say they, we must assure ourselves, by a chain of reasoning, deduced from some original principle, which cannot possibly be fallacious or deceitful. But neither is there any such original principle, which has a prerogative above others, that are self-evident and convincing: or if there were, could we advance a step beyond it, but by the use of those very faculties of which we are supposed to be already diffident. The

Cartesian doubt, therefore, were it ever possible to be attained by any human creature (as it plainly is not), would be entirely incurable; and no reasoning could ever bring us to a state of assurance and conviction upon any subject.

It must, however, be confessed, that the species of scepticism, when more moderate, may be understood in a very reasonable sense, and is a necessary preparative to the study of philosophy, by preserving a proper impartiality in our judgments, and weaning our mind from all those prejudices which we may have imbibed from education or rash opinion. To begin with clear and self-evident principles, to advance by timorous and sure steps, to review frequently our conclusions, and examine accurately all their consequences, though by these means we shall make both a slow and a short progress in our systems, are the only methods by which we can ever hope to reach truth, and attain a proper stability and certainty in our determinations.

There is another species of scepticism, *consequent* to science and enquiry, when men are supposed to have discovered, either the absolute fallaciousness of their mental faculties, or their unfitness to reach any fixed determination in all those curious subjects of speculation, about which they are commonly employed. Even our very senses are brought into dispute, by a certain species of philosophers, and the maxims of common life are subjected to the same doubt as the most profound principles or conclusions of metaphysics and theology. As these paradoxical tenets (if they may be called tenets) are to be met with in some philosophers, and the refutation of them in several, they naturally excite our curiosity, and make us inquire into the arguments on which they may be founded.

I need not insist upon the more trite topics, employed by the sceptics in all ages, against the evidence of *sense*, such as those which are derived from the imperfection and fallaciousness of our organs, on numberless occasions, the crooked appearance of an oar in water, the various aspects of objects, according to their different distances, the double images which arise from the pressing one eye, with many other appearances of a like nature. These sceptical topics, indeed, are only sufficient to prove, that the senses alone are not implicitly to be depended on, but that we must correct their evidence by reason, and by considerations, derived from the nature of the medium, the distance of the object, and the disposition of the organ, in order to render them, within their sphere, the proper *criteria* of truth and falsehood. There are other more profound arguments against the senses, which admit not of so easy a solution.

It seems evident, that men are carried by a natural instinct or prepossession to repose faith in their senses; and that, without any reasoning, or even almost before the use of reason, we always suppose an external universe, which depends not on our perception, but would

exist, though we and every sensible creature were absent or annihilated Even the animal creation are governed by a like opinion, and preserve this belief of external objects, in all their thoughts, designs, and actions.

It seems also evident, that, when men follow this blind and powerful instinct of nature, they always suppose the very images, presented by the senses, to be the external objects, and never entertain any suspicion that the one are nothing but representations of the other This very table, which we see white, and which we feel hard, is believed to exist, independent of our perception, and to be something external to our mind, which perceives it Our presence bestows not being on it our absence does not annihilate it It preserves its existence uniform and entire, independent of the situation of intelligent beings, who perceive or contemplate it.

But this universal and primary opinion of all men is soon destroyed by the slightest philosophy, which teaches us that nothing can ever be present to the mind but an image or perception, and that the senses are only the inlets through which these images are conveyed, without being able to produce any immediate intercourse between the mind and the object. The table, which we see, seems to diminish, as we remove farther from it but the real table, which exists independent of us, suffers no alteration it was, therefore, nothing but its image which was present to the mind These are the obvious dictates of reason, and no man, who reflects, ever doubted, that the existences, which we consider, when we say, *this house* and *that tree*, are nothing but perceptions in the mind, and fleeting copies or representations of other existences, which remain uniform and independent

So, far, then, are we necessitated, by reasoning, to contradict or depart from the primary instincts of nature, and to embrace a new system with regard to the evidence of our senses. But here philosophy finds herself extremely embarrassed, when she would justify this new system, and obviate the cavils and objections of the sceptics She can no longer plead the infallible and irresistible instinct of nature for that led us to a quite different system, which is acknowledged fallible, and even erroneous And to justify this pretended philosophical system by a chain of clear and convincing argument, or even any appearance of argument, exceeds the power of all human capacity

By what argument can it be proved, that the perceptions of the mind must be caused by external objects, entirely different from them, though resembling them (if that be possible), and could not arise either from the energy of the mind itself, or from the suggestion of some invisible and unknown spirit, or from some other cause still more unknown to us? It is acknowledged, that, in fact, many of these perceptions arise not from any thing external, as in dreams, madness,

and other diseases And nothing can be more inexplicable than the manner in which body should so operate upon mind, as ever to convey an image of itself to a substance, supposed to be of so different, and even contrary a nature

It is a question of fact, whether the perceptions of the senses be produced by external objects resembling them how shall this question be determined? By experience, surely, as all other questions of a like nature. But here experience is, and must be, entirely silent. The mind has never anything present to it but the perceptions, and cannot possibly reach any experience of their connection with objects. The supposition of such a connection is, therefore, without any foundation in reasoning

To have recourse to the veracity of the Supreme Being in order to prove the veracity of our senses, is surely making a very unexpected circuit If his veracity were at all concerned in this matter, our senses would be entirely infallible, because it is not possible that he can ever deceive Not to mention, that, if the external world be once called in question, we shall be at a loss to find arguments by which we may prove the existence of that Being, or any of his attributes.

This is a topic, therefore, in which the profounder and more philosophical sceptics will always triumph, when they endeavour to introduce an universal doubt into all subjects of human knowledge and inquiry Do you follow the instincts and propensities of nature, may they say, in assenting to the veracity of sense? But these lead you to believe that the very perception or sensible image is the external object Do you disclaim this principle, in order to embrace a more rational opinion, that the perceptions are only representations of something external? You here depart from your natural propensities, and more obvious sentiments, and yet are not able to satisfy your reasons, which can never find any convincing argument from experience to prove, that the perceptions are connected with any external objects

There is another sceptical topic of a like nature, derived from the most profound philosophy, which might merit our attention, were it requisite to dive so deep, in order to discover arguments and reasonings, which can serve so little any serious purpose. It is universall allowed by modern inquirers, that all the sensible qualities of objects such as hard, soft, hot, cold, white, black, &c, are merely secondary and exist not in the objects themselves, but are preceptions of the mind, without any external archetype or model, which they represent. If this be allowed with regard to secondary qualities, it must also follow, with regard to the supposed primary qualities of extension and solidity: nor can the latter be any more entitled to that denomination than the former. The idea of extension is entirely acquired from the senses of sight and feeling; and if all the qualities, perceived by the

senses, be in the mind, not in the object, the same conclusion must reach the idea of extension, which is wholly dependent on the sensible ideas, or the ideas of secondary qualities. Nothing can save us from this conclusion, but the asserting, that the ideas of those primary qualities are attained by *Abstraction*, an opinion which, if we examine it accurately, we shall find to be unintelligible, and even absurd. An extension, that is neither tangible nor visible, cannot possibly be conceived and a tangible or visible extension, which is neither hard nor soft, black or white, is equally beyond the reach of human conception. Let any man try to conceive a triangle in general, which is neither *Isoceles* nor *Scalenum*, nor has any particular length or proportion of sides, and he will soon perceive the absurdity of all the scholastic notions with regard to abstraction and general ideas.*

Thus the first philosophical objection to the evidence of sense, or to the opinion of external existence, consists in this, that such an opinion, if rested on natural instinct, is contrary to reason, and if referred to reason, is contrary to natural instinct, and at the same time carries no rational evidence with it, to convince an impartial inquirer The second objection goes farther, and represents this opinion as contrary to reason at least, if it be a principle of reason, that all sensible qualities are in the mind, not in the object Bereave matter of all its intelligible qualities, both primary and secondary, you in a manner annihilate it, and leave only a certain unknown, inexplicable *something*, as the cause of our perceptions, a notion so imperfect, that no sceptic will think it worth while to contend against it.

PART II —It may seem a very extravagant attempt of the sceptics to destroy *reason* by argument and ratiocination, yet this is the grand scope of all their inquiries and disputes They endeavour to find objections, both to our abstract reasonings, and to those which regard matter of fact and existence

The chief objection against all *abstract* reasonings is derived from the ideas of space and time, ideas which, in common life, and to a careless view, are very clear and intelligible, but when they pass through the scrutiny of the profound sciences (and they are the chief object of these sciences), afford principles which seem full of absurdity and contradiction. No *dogmas*, invented on purpose to tame and subdue the rebellious reason of mankind, ever shocked common sense

* This argument is drawn from Dr Berkley and indeed most of the writings of that very ingenious author form the best lessons of scepticism which are to be found either among the ancient or modern philosophers, Bayle not excepted. He professes, however, in his title-page (and undoubtedly with great truth) to have composed his book against the sceptics as well as against the atheists and free-thinkers. But that all his arguments, though otherwise intended, are, in reality, merely sceptical, appears from this, *that they admit of no answer and produce no conviction*. Their only effect is to cause that momentary amazement and irresolution and confusion, which is the result of scepticism.

more than the doctrine of the infinite divisibility of extension, with its consequences, as they are pompously displayed by all geometricians and metaphysicians, with a kind of triumph and exultation. A real quantity, infinitely less than any finite quantity, containing quantities infinitely less than itself, and so on *in infinitum*, this is an edifice so bold and prodigious, that is is too weighty for any pretended demonstration to support, because it shocks the clearest and most natural principles of human reason* But what renders the matter more extraordinary, is, that these seemingly absurd opinions are supported by a chain of reasoning, the clearest and most natural, nor is it possible for us to allow the premises without admitting the consequences Nothing can be more convincing and satisfactory than all the conclusions concerning the properties of circles and triangles, and yet when these are once received, how can we deny, that the angle of contact between a circle and its tangent is infinitely less than any rectilineal angle, that as you may increase the diameter of the circle *in infinitum*, this angle of contact becomes still less, even *in infinitum*, and that the angle of contact between other curves and their tangents may be infinitely less than those between any circle and its tangents, and so on, *in infinitum*? The demonstration of these principles seems as unexceptionable as that which proves the three angles of a triangle to be equal to two right ones, though the latter opinion be natural and easy, and the former big with contradiction and absurdity Reason here seems to be thrown into a kind of amazement and suspense, which, without the suggestions of any sceptic, gives her a diffidence of herself, and of the ground on which she treads She sees a full light which illuminates certain places, but that light borders upon the most profound darkness. And between these she is so dazzled and confounded, that she scarcely can pronounce with certainty and assurance, concerning any one object.

The absurdity of these bold determinations of the abstract sciences seems to become, if possible, still more palpable with regard to time than extension. An infinite number of real parts of time, passing in succession, and exhausted one after another, appears so evident a contradiction, that no man, one should think, whose judgment is not corrupted, instead of being improved by the sciences, would ever be able to admit it.

Yet still reason must remain restless and unquiet, even with regard to that scepticism, to which she is driven by these seeming absurdities

* Whatever disputes there may be about mathematical points, we must allow that there are physical points; that is, parts of extension, which cannot be divided or lessened, either by the eye or imagination. These images, then, which are present to the fancy or senses, are [illegible] indivisible, and consequently must be allowed by mathematicians to be infinitely less than any real part of extension; and yet nothing appears more certain to reason, than that an infinite number of them composes an infinite extension. How much more an infinite number of those infinitely small parts of extension, which are still supposed infinitely [illegible]

and contradictions. How any clear, distinct idea, can contain circumstances contradictory to itself, or to any other clear, distinct idea, is absolutely incomprehensible, and is, perhaps, as absurd as any proposition which can be formed. So that nothing can be more sceptical, or more full of doubt and hesitation, than this scepticism itself, which arises from some of the paradoxical conclusions of geometry or the science of quantity.*

The sceptical objections to *moral* evidence, or to the reasonings concerning matter of fact, are either *popular* or *philosophical*. The popular objections are derived from the natural weakness of human understanding, the contradictory opinions, which have been entertained in different ages and nations, the variations of our judgment in sickness and health, youth and old age, prosperity and adversity, the perpetual contradiction of each particular man's opinions and sentiments, with many other topics of that kind. It is needless to insist farther on this head. These objections are but weak. For as, in common life, we reason every moment concerning fact and existence, and cannot possibly subsist, without continually employing this species of argument, any popular objections, derived from thence, must be insufficient to destroy that evidence. The great subverter of *Pyrrhonism*, or the excessive principles of scepticism, is action, and employment, and the occupations of common life. These principles may flourish and triumph in the schools, where it is indeed difficult, if not impossible, to refute them. But as soon as they leave the shade, and by the presence of the real objects, which actuate our passions and sentiments, are put in opposition to the more powerful principles of our nature, they vanish like smoke, and leave the most determined sceptic in the same condition as other mortals.

The sceptic, therefore, had better keep within his proper sphere, and display those *philosophical* objections, which arise from more profound researches. Here he seems to have ample matter of triumph, while he justly insists, that all our evidence for any matter of fact, which lies beyond the testimony of sense or memory, is derived entirely from the relation of cause and effect, that we have no other

* It seems to me not impossible to avoid these absurdities and contradictions, if it be admitted that there is no such thing as abstract or general ideas properly speaking; but that all general ideas are, in reality, particular ones attached to a general term which recalls, upon occasion, other particular ones that resemble, in certain circumstances, the idea present to the mind. Thus when the term Horse is pronounced, we immediately figure to ourselves the idea of a black or a white animal, of a particular size or figure: but as that term is also usually applied to animals of other colours, figures, and sizes, these ideas, though not actually present to the imagination, are easily recalled, and our reasoning and conclusion proceed in the same way as if they were actually present. If this be admitted (as seems reasonable) it follows, that all the ideas of quantity, upon which mathematicians reason, are nothing but particular, and such as are suggested by the senses and imagination, and consequently cannot be infinitely divisible. It is sufficient to have dropped this hint at present, without prosecuting it any farther. It certainly concerns all lovers of science not to expose themselves to the ridicule and contempt of the ignorant by their conclusions, and this seems the readiest solution of these difficulties.

idea of this relation than that of two objects, which have been frequently *conjoined* together, that we have no argument to convince us, that objects, which have, in our experience, been frequently conjoined, will likewise, in other instances, be conjoined in the same manner, and that nothing leads us to this inference but custom, or a certain instinct of our nature, which it is indeed difficult to resist, but which like other instincts, may be fallacious and deceitful. While the sceptic insists upon these topics, he shews his force, or rather, indeed, his own and our weakness, and seems, for the time at least, to destroy all assurance and conviction. These arguments might be displayed at greater length, if any durable good or benefit to society could ever be expected to result from them.

For here is the chief and most confounding objection to *excessive* scepticism, that no durable good can ever result from it, while it remains in its full force and vigour. We need only ask such a sceptic, *What his meaning is? And what he proposes by all these curious researches?* He is immediately at a loss, and knows not what to answer. A COPERNICAN or PTOLEMAIC, who supports each his different system of astronomy, may hope to produce a conviction which will remain constant and durable, with his audience. A STOIC or EPICUREAN displays principles, which may not only be durable, but which have an effect on conduct and behaviour. But a PYRRHONIAN cannot expect, that his philosophy will have any constant influence on the mind: or if it had, that its influence would be beneficial to society. On the contrary, he must acknowledge, if he will acknowledge any thing, that all human life must perish, were his principles universally and steadily to prevail. All discourse, all action, would immediately cease, and men remain in a total lethargy, till the necessities of nature unsatisfied, put an end to their miserable existence. It is true, so fatal an event is very little to be dreaded. Nature is always too strong for principle. And though a PYRRHONIAN may throw himself or others into a momentary amazement and confusion by his profound reasonings, the first and most trivial event in life will put to flight all his doubts and scruples, and leave him the same, in every point of action and speculation, with the philosophers of every other sect, or with those who never concerned themselves in any philosophical researches. When he awakes from his dream, he will be the first to join in the laugh against himself, and to confess, that all his objections are mere amusement, and can have no other tendency than to show the whimsical condition of mankind, who must act, and reason, and believe, though they are not able, by their most diligent inquiry, to satisfy themselves concerning the foundation of these operations, or to remove the objections, which may be raised against them.

PART III —There is, indeed, a more *mitigated* scepticism or *academical* philosophy, which may be both durable and useful, which may, in part, be the result of this PYRRHONISM, or *excessive* scepticism, when its undistinguished doubts are, in some measure, corrected by common sense and reflection The greater part of mankind are naturally apt to be affirmative and dogmatical in their opinions , and while they see objects only on one side, and have no idea of any counterpoising argument, they throw themselves precipitately into the principles to which they are inclined nor have they any indulgence for those who entertain opposite sentiments To hesitate or balance perplexes their understanding, checks their passion, and suspends their action. They are, therefore, impatient till they escape from a state, which to them is so uneasy , and they think, that they can never remove themselves far enough from it by the violence of their affirmations and obstinacy of their belief But could such dogmatical reasoners become sensible of the strange infirmities of human understanding, even in its most perfect state, and when most accurate and cautious in its determinations , such a reflection would naturally inspire them with more modesty and reserve, and diminish their fond opinion of themselves, and there prejudice against antagonists The illiterate may reflect on the disposition of the learned, who, amidst all the advantages of study and reflection, are commonly still diffident in their determinations and if any of the learned be inclined, from their natural temper, to haughtiness and obstinacy, a small tincture of PYRRHONISM might abate their pride, by shewing them, that the few advantages, which they may have attained over their fellows, are but inconsiderable, if compared with the universal perplexity and confusion, which is inherent in human nature In general, there is a degree of doubt, and caution, and modesty, which, in all kinds of scrutiny and decision, ought for ever to accompany a just reasoner

Another species of *mitigated* scepticism, which may be of advantage to mankind, and which may be the natural result of the PYRRHONIAN doubts and scruples, is the limitation of our inquiries to such subjects as are best adapted to the narrow capacity of human understanding The *imagination* of man is naturally sublime, delighted with whatever is remote and extraordinary, and running, without control, into the most distant parts of space and time, in order to avoid the objects which custom has rendered too familiar to it A correct *judgment* observes a contrary method, and, avoiding all distant and high inquiries, confines itself to common life, and to such subjects as fall under daily practice and experience ; leaving the more sublime topics to the embellishment of poets and orators, or to the arts of politicians. To bring us to so salutary a determination, nothing can be more serviceable, than to be once thoroughly convinced of the force of the PYRRHONIAN doubt, and of the impossibility, that any thing but the

strong power of natural instinct, could free us from it. Those who have a propensity to philosophy, will still continue their researches; because they reflect, that, besides the immediate pleasure, attending such an occupation, philosophical decisions are nothing but the reflections of common life, methodized and corrected But they will never be tempted to go beyond common life, so long as they consider the imperfection of those faculties which they employ, their narrow reach, and their inaccurate operations While we cannot give a satisfactory reason why we believe, after a thousand experiments, that a stone will fall, or fire burn, can we ever satisfy ourselves concerning any determination, which we may form, with regard to the origin of worlds, and the situation of nature, from and to eternity?

This narrow limitation, indeed, of our inquiries, is, in every respect, so reasonable, that it suffices to make the slightest examination into the natural powers of the human mind, and to compare them with their objects, in order to recommend it to us We shall then find what are the proper subjects of science and inquiry

It seems to me, that the only objects of the abstract sciences or of demonstration are quantity and number, and that all attempts to extend this more perfect species of knowledge beyond these bounds are mere sophistry and illusion As the component parts of quantity and number are entirely similar, their relations become intricate and involved and nothing can be more curious, as well as useful, than to trace, by a variety of mediums, their equality, or inequality, through their different appearances But as all other ideas are clearly distinct and different from each other, we can never advance farther, by our utmost scrutiny, than to observe this diversity, and by an obvious reflection, pronounce one thing not to be another Or if there be any difficulty in these decisions, it proceeds entirely from the undeterminate meaning of words, which is corrected by juster definitions. That *the square of the hypothenuse is equal to the squares of the other two sides*, cannot be known, let the terms be ever so exactly defined, without a train of reasoning and inquiry But to convince us of this proposition, *that where there is no property, there can be no injustice*, it is only necessary to define the terms, and explain injustice to be a violation of property This proposition is, indeed, nothing but a more imperfect definition. It is the some case with all those pretended syllogistical reasonings, which may be found in every other branch of learning, except the sciences of quantity and number; and these may safely, I think, be pronounced the only proper objects of knowledge and of demonstration.

All other inquiries of men regard only matter of fact and existence; and these are evidently incapable of demonstration. Whatever is may not be. No negation of a fact can involve a contradiction. The non-existence of any being, without exception, is as clear and distinct an

idea as its existence. The proposition, which affirms it not to be, however false, is no less conceivable and intelligible, than that which affirms it to be. The case is different with the sciences, properly so called. Every proposition, which is not true, is there confused and unintelligible. That the cube root of 64 is equal to the half of 10, is a false proposition, and can never be distinctly conceived. But that Cæsar, or the angel Gabriel, or any being never existed, may be a false proposition, but still is perfectly conceivable, and it implies no contradiction.

The existence, therefore, of any being, can only be proved by arguments from its cause or its effect; and these arguments are founded entirely on experience. If we reason *a priori*, any thing may appear able to produce any thing. The falling of a pebble may, for ought we know, extinguish the sun; or the wish of a man control the planets in their orbits. It is only experience, which teaches us the nature and bounds of cause and effect, and enables us to infer the existence of one object from that of another.* Such is the foundation of moral reasoning, which forms the greater part of human knowledge, and is the source of all human action and behaviour.

Moral reasonings are either concerning particular or general facts. All deliberations in life regard the former; as also all disquisitions in history, chronology, geography, and astronomy.

The sciences, which treat of general facts, are politics, natural philosophy, physic, chemistry, &c. where the qualities, causes, and effects of a whole species of objects are inquired into.

Divinity or theology, as it proves the existence of a Deity, and the immortality of souls, is composed partly of reasonings concerning particular, partly concerning general facts. It has a foundation in *reason*, so far as it is supported by experience. But its best and most solid foundation is *faith* and divine revelation.

Morals and criticism are not so properly objects of the understanding as of taste and sentiment. Beauty, whether moral or natural, is felt more properly than perceived. Or if we reason concerning it, and endeavour to fix its standard, we regard a new fact, to wit, the general taste of mankind, or some such fact, which may be the object of reasoning and inquiry.

When we run over libraries, persuaded of these principles, what havoc must we make? If we take in our hand any volume, of divinity or school metaphysics, for instance; let us ask, *Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number?* No. Does

* That impious maxim of the ancient philosophy, *Ex nihilo, nihil fit*, by which the creation of matter was excluded, ceases to be a maxim, according to this philosophy. Not only the will of the supreme being may create matter; but, for aught we know *a priori*, the will of any other being might create it, or any other cause, that the most whimsical imagination can assign.

it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence? No. Commit it then to the flames, for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion.

ESSAY XL.—A DISSERTATION ON THE PASSIONS.

1. SOME objects produce immediately an agreeable sensation, by the original structure of our organs, and are thence denominated GOOD, as others, from their immediate disagreeable sensation, acquire the appellation of EVIL. Thus moderate warmth is agreeable and good, excessive heat painful and evil.

Some objects again, by being naturally conformable or contrary to passion, excite an agreeable or painful sensation, and are thence called *Good* or *Evil*. The punishment of an adversary, by gratifying revenge, is good, the sickness of a companion, by affecting friendship, is evil.

2. All good or evil, whence-ever it arises, produces various passions and affections, according to the light in which it is surveyed.

When good is certain or very probable, it produces JOY. When evil is in the same situation, there arises GRIEF or SORROW.

When either good or evil is uncertain, it gives rise to FEAR or HOPE, according to the degree of uncertainty on one side or the other.

DESIRE arises from good, considered simply, and AVERSION, from evil. The WILL exerts itself, when either the presence of the good, or absence of the evil, may be attained by any action of the mind or body.

3. None of these passions seem to contain any thing curious and remarkable, except *Hope* and *Fear*, which, being derived from the probability of any good or evil, are mixed passions, that merit our attention.

Probability arises from an opposition of contrary chances or causes, by which the mind is not allowed to fix on either side, but is incessantly tossed from one to another, and is determined, one moment to consider an object as existent, and another moment as the contrary. The imagination or understanding, call it which you please, fluctuates between the opposite views, and though perhaps it may be oftener turned to one side than the other, it is impossible for it, by reason of the opposition of causes or chances, to rest on either. The pro and con of the question alternately prevail, and the mind, sur-

veying the objects in their opposite causes, finds such a contrariety as destroys all certainty or established opinion.

Suppose, then, that the object, concerning which we are doubtful, produces either desire or aversion, it is evident, that, according as the mind turns itself to one side or the other, it must feel a momentary impression of joy or sorrow. An object, whose existence we desire, gives satisfaction, when we think of those causes which produce it, and for the same reason, excites grief or uneasiness from the opposite consideration. So that, as the understanding, in probable questions, is divided between the contrary points of view, the heart must in the same manner be divided between opposite motions.

Now, if we consider the human mind, we shall observe, that with regard to the passions, it is not like a wind instrument of music, which in running over all the notes, immediately loses the sound when the breath ceases, but rather resembles a string-instrument, where, after each stroke, the vibrations still retain some sound, which gradually and insensibly decays. The imagination is extremely quick and agile, but the passions, in comparison, are slow and restive: for which reason, when any object is presented, which affords a variety of views to the one and emotions to the other, though the fancy may change its views with great celerity, each stroke will not produce a clear and distinct note of passion, but the one passion will always be mixed and confounded with the other. According as the probability inclines to good or evil, the passion of grief or joy predominates in the composition, and these passions being intermingled by means of the contrary views of the imagination, produce by the union the passions of hope and fear.

4. As this theory seems to carry its own evidence along with it, we shall be more concise in our proofs.

The passions of fear and hope may arise when the chances are equal on both sides, and no superiority can be discovered in one above the other. Nay, in this situation, the passions are rather the strongest, as the mind has then the least foundation to rest upon, and is tossed with the greatest uncertainty. Throw in a superior degree of probability to the side of grief, you immediately see that passion diffuse itself over the composition, and tincture it into fear. Increase the probability, and by that means the grief, the fear prevails still more and more, 'till at last it runs insensibly, as the joy continually diminishes, into pure grief. After you have brought it to this situation, diminish the grief, by a contrary operation to that which increased it, to wit, by diminishing the probability on the melancholy side; and you will see the passion clear every moment, 'till it changes insensibly into hope, which again runs, by slow degrees, into joy, as you increase that part of the composition, by the increase of the probability. Are not these as plain proofs, that the passions of fear and

hope are mixtures of grief and joy, as in optics it is a proof, that a coloured ray of the sun, passing through a prism, is a composition of two others, when, as you diminish or increase the quantity of either, you find it prevail proportionably, more or less, in the composition?

5. Probability is of two kinds, either when the object is itself, uncertain, and to be determined by chance, or when, though the object be already certain, yet it is uncertain to our judgment, which finds a number of proofs or presumptions on each side of the question. Both these kinds of probability cause fear and hope, which must proceed from that property, in which they agree, namely, the uncertainty and fluctuation which they bestow on the passion, by that contrariety of views, which is common to both

6. It is a probable good or evil, which commonly causes hope or fear, because probability, producing an inconstant and wavering survey of an object, occasions naturally a like mixture and uncertainty of passion. But we may observe, that, wherever, from other causes this mixture can be produced, the passions of fear and hope will arise, even though there be no probability

An evil, conceived as barely *possible*, sometimes produces fear, especially if the evil be very great A man cannot think on excessive pain and torture without trembling, if he runs the least risk of suffering them The smallness of the probability is compensated by the greatness of the evil

But even *impossible* evils cause fear, as when we tremble on the brink of a precipice, though we know ourselves to be in perfect security, and have it in our choice, whether we will advance a step farther The immediate presence of the evil influences the imagination, and produces a species of belief, but being opposed by the reflection on our security, that belief is immediately retracted, and causes the same kind of passion, as when, from a contrariety of chances, contrary passions are produced.

Evils, which are *certain*, have sometimes the same effect as the possible or impossible A man in a strong prison, without the least means of escape trembles at the thoughts of the rack, to which he is sentenced. The evil is here fixed in itself, but the mind has not courage to fix upon it, and this fluctuation gives rise to a passion of a similar appearance with fear

7. But it is not only where good or evil is uncertain as to its *existence*, but also as to its *kind*, that fear or hope arises. If any one were told that one of his sons is suddenly killed, the passion, occasioned by this event, would not settle into grief, till he got certain information which of his sons he had lost. Though each side of the question produces here the same passion; that passion cannot settle, but receives from the imagination, which is unfixed, a tremulous unsteady motion, resembling the mixture and contention of grief and joy.

8 Thus all kinds of uncertainty have a strong connection with fear even though they do not cause any opposition of passions, by the opposite views which they present to us. Should I leave a friend in any malady, I should feel more anxiety upon his account, than if he were present, though perhaps I am not only incapable of giving him assistance, but likewise of judging concerning the event of his sickness. There are a thousand little circumstances of his situation and condition which I desire to know, and the knowledge of them would prevent that fluctuation and uncertainty, so nearly allied to fear Horace has remarked this phenomenon

Ut assidens implumibus pullus avis Serpentum allapsus timet,
Magis relictis, non, ut adsit, auxili Latura plus præsentibus.

9. Concerning the mixture of affections, we may remark, in general, that when contrary passions arise from objects nowise connected together, they take place alternately Thus when a man is afflicted for the loss of a law-suit, and joyful for the birth of a son, the mind, running from the agreeable to the calamitous object, with whatever celerity it may perform this motion, can scarcely temper the one affection with the other, and remain between them in a state of indifference

It more easily attains that calm situation, when the *same* event is of a mixed nature, and contains something adverse and something prosperous in its different circumstances For in that case, both the passions, mingling with each other by means of the relation, often become mutually destructive, and leave the mind in perfect tranquility

But suppose that the object is not a compound of good and evil, but is considered as probable or improbable in any degree, in that case, the contrary passions will both of them be present at once in the soul, and instead of balancing and tempering each other, will subsist together, and by their union produce a third impression or affection, such as hope or fear

The influence of the relations of ideas (which we shall explain more fully afterwards) is plainly seen in this affair In contrary passions, if the objects be *totally different*, the passions are like two opposite liquors in different bottles, which have no influence on each other. If the objects be intimately *connected*, the passions are like an *alkali* and an *acid*, which, being mingled, destroy each other. If the relation be more imperfect, and consist in the *contradictory* view of the same object, the passions are like oil and vinegar, which, however mingled, never perfectly unite and incorporate.

The effect of a mixture of passions, when one of them is predominant and swallows up the other, shall be explained afterwards.

SECTION II.

1 Besides those passions above mentioned, which arise from a direct pursuit of good, and aversion to evil, there are others which are of a more complicated nature, and imply more than one view or consideration. Thus *Pride* is a certain satisfaction in ourselves, on account of some accomplishment or possession which we enjoy *Humility*, on the other hand, is a dissatisfaction with ourselves on account of some defect or infirmity

Love or *Friendship* is a complacency in another, on account of his accomplishments or services *Hatred*, the contrary

2 In these two sets of passions, there is an obvious distinction to be made between the *object* of the passion and its *cause* The object of pride and humility is self the cause of the passion is some excellence, in the former case, some fault, in the latter The object of love and hatred is some other person the causes, in like manner, are either excellencies or faults

With regard to all these passions, the causes are what excite the emotion, the object is what the mind directs its views to when the emotion is excited Our merit, for instance, raises pride, and it is essential to pride to turn our view on ourselves with complacency and satisfaction

Now, as the causes of these passions are very numerous and various, though their object be uniform and simple, it may be a subject of curiosity to consider what that circumstance is in which all these various causes agree or, in other words, what is the real efficient cause of the passion We shall begin with pride and humanity

3 In order to explain the causes of these passions, we must reflect on certain principles which, though they have a mighty influence on every operation both of the understanding and passions, are not commonly much insisted on by philosophers. I Is the *association* of these ideas, or that principle by which we make an easy transition from one idea to another However uncertain and changeable our thoughts may be, they are not entirely without rule and method in their changes. They usually pass with regularity, from one object, to what resembles it, is contiguous to it, or produced by it. When one idea is present to the imagination, any other, united by these relations, naturally follow it, and enters with more facility, by means of that introduction.

II. The human mind, is a like association of impressions or emotions. All *resembling* impressions are connected together; and no sooner one arises than the rest naturally follow. Grief and disap-

pointment give rise to anger, anger to envy, envy to malice, and malice to grief again In like manner, our temper, when elevated with joy, naturally throws itself into love, generosity, courage, pride, and other resembling affections.

III It is observable of these two kinds of association, that they very much assist and forward each other, and that the transition is more easily made where they both concur in the same object. Thus, a man, who, by an injury received from another, is very much discomposed and ruffled in his temper, is apt to find a hundred subjects of hatred, discontent, impatience, fear, and other uneasy passions, especially if he can discover these subjects in or near the person who was the object of his first emotion Those principles, which forward the transition of ideas, here concur with those which operate on the passions, and both uniting in one action, bestow on the mind a double impulse

Upon this occasion, I may cite a passage from an elegant writer, who expresses himself in the following manner [Addison, Spec. No. 412] 'As the fancy delights in every thing that is great, strange, or 'beautiful, and is still the more pleased the more it finds of these per'fections in the *same* object, so it is capable of receiving new satisfac'tion by the assistance of another sense Thus, any continual sound, 'as the music of birds, or a fall of waters, awakens every moment the 'mind of the beholder, and makes him more attentive to the several 'beauties of the place that lie before him Thus, if there arises a 'fragrancy of smells or perfumes, they heighten the pleasure of the 'imagination, and make even the colours and verdure of the landscape 'appear more agreeable, for the ideas of both senses recommend each 'other, and are pleasanter together than where they enter the mind 'separately as the different colours of a picture, when they are 'well disposed, set off one another, and receive an additional beauty 'from the advantage of the situation' In these phenomena we may remark the association both of impressions and ideas, as well as the mutual assistance these associations lend to each other.

4. It seems to me, that both these species of relation have place in producing *Pride or Humility*, and are the real, efficient causes, of the passion.

With regard to the first relation, that of ideas, there can be no question. Whatever we are proud of must, in some manner, belong to us. It is always *our* knowledge, *our* sense, beauty, possessions, family, on which we value ourselves. Self, which is the *object* of the passion, must still be related to that quality or circumstance, which causes the passion. There must be a connection between them; an easy transition of the imagination; or a facility of the conception in passing from one to the other. Where this connection is wanting, no object

can either excite pride or humility, and the more you weaken the connection, the more you weaken the passion.

5. The only subject of inquiry is, whether there be a like relation of impressions or sentiments, wherever pride or humility is felt, whether the circumstance, which causes the passion, previously excites a sentiment similar to the passion, and whether there be an easy transfusion of the one into the other

The feeling or sentiment of pride is agreeable, of humility, painful. An agreeable sensation is, therefore, related to the former, a painful, to the latter And if we find, after examination, that every object, which produces pride, produces also a separate pleasure, and every object, which causes humility, excites in like manner a separate uneasiness, we must allow, in that case, that the present theory is fully proved and ascertained The double relation of ideas and sentiments will be acknowledged incontestible

6. To begin with personal merit and demerit, the most obvious causes of these passions, it would be entirely foreign to our present purpose to examine the foundation of moral distinctions It is sufficient to observe, that the foregoing theory concerning the origin of the passions may be defended on any hypothesis The most probable system, which has been advanced to explain the difference between vice and virtue, is, that either from a primary constitution of nature, or from a sense of public or private interest, certain characters, upon the very view and contemplation, produce uneasiness, and others, in like manner, excite pleasure The uneasiness and satisfaction, produced in the spectator, are essential to vice and virtue To approve of a character, is to feel a delight upon its appearance. To disapprove of it, is to be sensible of an uneasiness The pain and pleasure, therefore, being in a manner the primary source of blame or praise, must also be the causes of all their effects, and consequently, the causes of pride and humility, which are the unavoidable attendants of that distinction.

But supposing this theory of morals should not be received, it is still evident that pain and pleasure, if not the sources of moral distinctions, are at least inseparable from them A generous and noble character affords a satisfaction even in the survey and when presented to us, though only in a poem or fable, never fails to charm and delight us. On the other hand, cruelty and treachery displease from their very nature; nor is it possible ever to reconcile us to these qualities, either in ourselves or others. Virtue, therefore, produces always a pleasure distinct from the pride or self-satisfaction which attends it: vice, an uneasiness separate from the humility or remorse.

But a high or low conceit of ourselves arises not from those qualities alone of the mind, which, according to common systems of ethics, have been defined parts of moral duty, but from any other, which

have a connection with pleasure or uneasiness. Nothing flatters our vanity more than the talent of pleasing by our wit, good-humour, or any other accomplishment, and nothing gives us a more sensible mortification, than a disappointment in any attempt of that kind. No one has ever been able to tell precisely, what *wit* is, and to show why such a system of thought must be received under that denomination, and such another rejected. It is by taste alone we can decide concerning it, nor are we possessed of any other standard, by which we can form a judgment of this nature. Now what is this *taste*, from which true and false wit in a manner receive their being, and without which no thought can have a title to either of these denominations? It is plainly nothing but a sensation of pleasure from true wit, and of disgust from false, without our being able to tell the reasons of that satisfaction or uneasiness. The power of exciting these opposite sensations is, therefore, the very essence of true or false wit, and consequently, the cause of that vanity or mortification, which arises from one or the other.

7. Beauty of all kinds gives us a peculiar delight and satisfaction, as deformity produces pain, upon whatever subject it may be placed, and whether surveyed in an animate or inanimate object. If the beautify or deformity belong to our own face, shape, or person, this pleasure or uneasiness is converted into pride or humility, as having in this case all the circumstances requisite to produce a perfect transition, according to the present theory.

It would seem that the very essence of beauty consists in its power of producing pleasure. All its effects, therefore, must proceed from this circumstance: and if beauty is so universally the subject of vanity, it is only from its being the cause of pleasure.

Concerning all other bodily accomplishments, we may observe in general, that whatever in ourselves is either useful, beautiful, or surprising, is an object of pride, and the contrary of humility. These qualities agree in producing a separate pleasure, and they agree in nothing else.

We are vain of the surprising adventures which we have met with, the escapes which we have made, the dangers to which we have been exposed, as well as of our surprising feats of vigour and activity. Hence the origin of vulgar lying, where men, without any interest, and merely out of vanity, heap up a number of extraordinary events, which are either the fictions of their brain, or, if true, have no connection with themselves. Their fruitful invention supplies them with a variety of adventures, and where that talent is wanting, they appropriate such as belong to others, in order to gratify their vanity: for between that passion, and the sentiment of pleasure, there is always a close connection.

8. But though pride and humility have the qualities of our mind

and body, that is, of self, for their natural and more immediate causes; we find by experience, that many other objects produce these affections. We found vanity upon houses, gardens, equipage, and other external objects, as well as upon personal merit and accomplishments. This happens when external objects acquire any particular relation to ourselves, and are associated or connected with us. A beautiful fish in the ocean, a well proportioned animal in a forest, and indeed any thing, which neither belongs nor is related to us, has no manner of influence on our vanity, whatever extraordinary qualities it may be endowed with, and whatever degree of surprise and admiration it may naturally occasion. It must be someway associated with us, in order to touch our pride. Its idea must hang, in a manner, upon that of ourselves, and the transition from one to the other must be easy and natural.

Men are vain of the beauty either of *their* country or *their* county, or even of *their* parish. Here the idea of beauty plainly produces a pleasure. This pleasure is related to pride. The object or cause of this pleasure is, by the supposition, related to self, the object of pride. By this double relation of sentiments and ideas, a transition is made from one to the other.

Men are also vain of the happy temperature of the climate in which they are born, of the fertility of their native soil, of the goodness of the wines, fruits, or victuals, produced by it, of the softness or force of their language, with other particulars of that kind. These objects have plainly a reference to the pleasures of sense, and are originally considered as agreeable to the feeling, taste, or hearing. How could they become causes of pride, except by means of that transition above explained?

There are some, who discover a vanity of an opposite kind, and affect to depreciate their own country, in comparison of those to which they have travelled. These persons find, when they are at home, and surrounded with their countrymen, that the strong relation between them and their own nation, is shared with so many, that it is in a manner lost to them; whereas, that distant relation to a foreign country, which is formed by their having seen it, and lived in it, is augmented by their considering how few have done the same. For this reason, they always admire the beauty, utility, and rarity of what they met with abroad, above what they find at home.

Since we can be vain of a country, climate, or any inanimate object, which bears a relation to us, it is no wonder we should be vain of the qualities of those who are connected with us by blood or friendship. Accordingly we find, that any qualities which, when belonging to ourselves, produce pride, produce also, in a less degree, the same affection, when discovered in persons related to us. The beauty, address, merit, credit, and honours of their kindred, are care-

fully displayed by the proud, and are considerable sources of their vanity

As we are proud of riches in ourselves, we desire, in order to gratify our vanity, that every one who has any connection with us, should likewise be possessed of them, and are ashamed of such as are mean or poor among our friends and relations Our forefathers being regarded as our nearest relations, every one naturally affects to be of a goodly family, and to be descended from a long succession of rich and honourable ancestors

Those, who boast of the antiquity of their families, are glad when they can join this circumstance, that their ancestors, for many generations, have been uninterrupted proprietors of the *same* portion of land, and that their family has never changed its possessions, or been transplanted into any other county or province It is an additional subject of vanity, when they can boast, that these possessions have been transmitted through a descent, composed entirely of males, and that the honours and fortune have never passed through any female Let us endeavour to explain these phenomena from the foregoing theory

When any one values himself on the antiquity of his family, the subjects of his vanity are not merely the extent of time and number of ancestors (for in that respect all mankind are alike), but these circumstances, joined to the riches and credit of his ancestors, which are supposed to reflect a lustre on himself, upon account of his connection with them. Since therefore the passion depends on the connection, whatever strengthens the connection must also increase the passion, and whatever weakens the connection must diminish the passion But it is evident, that the sameness of the possessions must strengthen the relations of ideas, arising from blood and kindred, and convey the fancy with greater facility from one generation to another, from the remotest ancestors to their posterity, who are both their heirs and their descendants By this facility, the sentiment is transmitted more entire, and excites a greater degree of pride and vanity

The case is the same with the transmission of the honours and fortune through a succession of males, without their passing through any female. It is an obvious quality of human nature, that the imagination naturally turns to whatever is important and considerable; and where two objects are presented, a small and a great, it usually leaves the former, and dwells entirely on the latter. This is the reason why children commonly bear their father's name, and are esteemed to be of a nobler or meaner birth, according to *his* family And though the mother should be possessed of superior qualities to the father, as often happens, the *general rule* prevails, notwithstanding the exception, according to the doctrine which shall be explained afterwards. Nay, even when superiority of any kind is so great, as, that any

other reasons have such an effect, as to make the children rather represent the mother's family than the father's, the general rule still retains an efficacy sufficient to weaken the relation, and make a kind of breach in the line of ancestors. The imagination runs not along them with the same facility, nor is able to transfer the honour and credit of the ancestors to their posterity of the same name and family so readily, as when the transition is conformable to the general rule, and passes through the male line, from father to son, or from brother to brother.

9. But *property*, as it gives us the fullest power and authority over any object, is the relation which has the greatest influence on these passions.*

Every thing, belonging to a vain man, is the best that is any where to be found. His houses, equipage, furniture, clothes, horses, hounds, excel all others in his conceit; and it is easy to observe, that from the least advantage in any of these, he draws a new subject of pride and vanity. His wine, if you will believe him, has a finer flavour than any other; his cookery is more exquisite; his table more orderly; his servants more expert; the air, in which he lives, more healthful; the soil, which he cultivates, more fertile; his fruits ripen earlier, and to greater perfection: such a thing is remarkable for its novelty; such another for its antiquity: this is the workmanship of a famous artist; that belonged once to such a prince or great man. All objects, in a word, which are useful, beautiful, or surprising, or are related to such, may by means of property, give rise to this passion. These all agree in giving pleasure. This alone is common to them; and therefore must be the quality that produces the passion, which is their common effect. As every new instance is a new argument, and as the instances are here without number; it would seem that this theory is sufficiently confirmed by experience.

Riches imply the power of acquiring whatever is agreeable; and as they comprehend many particular objects of vanity, necessarily become one of the chief causes of that passion.

10. Our opinions of all kinds are strongly affected by society and sympathy, and it is almost impossible for us to support any principle or sentiment against the universal consent of every one, with whom

* That property is a species of *relation*, which produces a connection between the person and the object, is evident: the imagination passes naturally and easily from the consideration of a field to that of the person to whom it belongs. It may only be asked, how this relation is resolvable into any of those three, viz. *causation*, *contiguity*, and *resemblance*, which we have affirmed to be the only connecting principles among ideas? To be the proprietor of any thing is to be the sole person, who, by the laws of society, has a right to dispose of it, and to enjoy the benefit of it. This right has at least a tendency to procure the person the exercise of it; and in fact does commonly procure him that advantage. For rights which had no influence, and never took place, would be no rights at all. Now a person, who disposes of an object, and reaps benefit from it, both produces or may produce, effects on it, and is affected by it. Property therefore is a species of *causation*. It enables the person to produce alterations on the object, and it supposes that his condition is improved and altered by it. It is indeed the relation the most interesting of any, and occurs the most frequently to the mind.

we have any friendship or correspondence. But of all our opinions, those which we form in our own favour, however lofty or presuming, are, at bottom, the frailest and the most easily shaken by the contradiction and opposition of others Our great concern, in this case, makes us soon alarmed, and keeps our passions upon the watch. our consciousness of partiality still makes us dread a mistake and the very difficulty of judging concerning an object, which is never set at a due distance from us, nor is seen in a proper point of view, makes us hearken anxiously to the opinions of others, who are better qualified to form just opinions concerning us Hence that strong love of fame with which all mankind are possessed It is in order to fix and confirm their favourable opinion of themselves, not from any original passion, that they seek the applauses of others And when a man desires to be praised, it is for the same reason, that a beauty is pleased with surveying herself in a favourable looking-glass, and seeing the reflection of her own charms

Though it be difficult, in all points of speculation to distinguish a cause, which increases an effect, from one, which solely produces it, yet in the present case the phenomena seem pretty strong and satisfactory in confirmation of the foregoing principle

We receive a much greater satisfaction from the approbation of those whom we ourselves esteem and approve of, than of those whom we contemn and despise

When esteem is obtained after a long and intimate acquaintance, it gratifies our vanity in a peculiar manner

The suffrage of those who are shy and backward in giving praise, is attended with an additional relish and enjoyment, if we can obtain it in our favour

Where a great man is delicate in his choice of favourites, every one courts with greater earnestness his countenance and protection

Praise never gives us much pleasure, unless it concur with our own opinion, and extol us for those qualities n which we chiefly excel.

These phenomena seem to prove, that the favourable suffrages of the world are regarded only as authorities, or as confirmations of our own opinion And if the opinions of others have more influence in this subject than in any other, it is easily accounted for from the nature of the subject

11. Thus few objects however related to us and whatever pleasure they produce, are able to excite a great degree of pride or self-satisfaction, unless they be also obvious to others, and engage the approbation of the spectators. What disposition of mind so desirable as the peaceful, resigned, contented, which readily submits to all the dispensations of Providence, and preserves a constant serenity amidst the greatest misfortunes and disappointments? Yet this disposition, though acknowledged to be a virtue or excellence, is seldom the founda-

dation of great vanity or self-applause; having no brilliancy or exterior lustre, and rather cheering the heart than animating the behaviour and conversation. The case is the same with many other qualities of the mind, body, or fortune; and this circumstance, as well as the double relations above mentioned, must be admitted to be of consequence in the production of these passions.

A second circumstance, which is of consequence in this affair, is the constancy and durableness of the object. What is very casual and inconstant, beyond the common course of human affairs, gives little joy, and less pride. We are not much satisfied with the thing itself; and are still less apt to feel any new degree of self-satisfaction upon its account. We foresee and anticipate its change; we compare it to ourselves, whose existence is more durable; by which means its inconstancy appears still greater. It seems ridiculous to make ourselves the object of a passion, on account of a quality or possession, which is of so much shorter duration, and attends us during so small a part of our existence.

A third circumstance, not to be neglected, is, that the objects, in order to produce pride or self-value, must be peculiar to us, or at least common to us with a few others. The advantages of sunshine, good weather, a happy climate, &c. distinguish us not from any of our companions, and give us no preference or superiority. The comparison, which we are every moment apt to make, presents no inference to our advantage; and we still remain, notwithstanding these enjoyments, on a level with all our friends and acquaintance.

As health and sickness vary incessantly to all men, and there is no one who is solely or certainly fixed in either; these accidental blessings and calamities are in a manner separated from us, and are not considered as a foundation for vanity or humiliation. But wherever a malady of any kind is so rooted in our constitution, that we no longer entertain any hope of recovery, from that moment it damps our self-conceit, as is evident in old men, whom nothing mortifies more than the consideration of their age and infirmities. They endeavour, as long as possible, to conceal their blindness and deafness, their rheums and gouts; nor do they ever avow them without reluctance and uneasiness. And though young men are not ashamed of every head-ache or cold which they fall into; yet no topic is more proper to mortify human pride, and make us entertain a mean opinion of our nature, than this, that we are every moment of our lives subject to such infirmities. This proves, that bodily pain and sickness are in themselves proper causes of humility; though the custom of estimating every thing by comparison, more than by its intrinsic worth and value, makes us overlook those calamities which we find incident to every one, and causes us to form an idea of our merit and character independent of them.

We are ashamed of such maladies as affect others, and are either dangerous or disagreeable to them. Of the epilepsy, because it gives a horror to every one present of the itch, because it is infectious: of the king's evil, because it often goes to posterity Men always consider the sentiments of others in their judgment of themselves.

A fourth circumstance, which has an influence on these passions, is *general rules*, by which we form a notion of different ranks of men, suitably to the power or riches of which they are possessed, and this notion is not changed by any peculiarities of the health or temper of the persons, which may deprive them of all enjoyment in their possessions Custom readily carries us beyond the just bounds in our passions as well as in our reasonings

It may not be amiss to observe on this occasion, that the influence of general rules and maxims on the passions very much contributes to facilitate the effects of all the principles of internal mechanism, which we here explain For it seems evident, that, if a person, full grown, and of the same nature with ourselves, were on a sudden transported into our world, he would be much embarrassed with every object, and would not readily determine what degree of love and hatred, of pride or humility, or of any other passion, should be excited by it. The passions are often varied by very inconsiderable principles, and these do not always play with perfect regularity, especially on the first trial. But as custom or practice has brought to light all these principles, and has settled the just value of everything, this must certainly contribute to the easy production of the passions and guide us, by means of general established rules, in the proportions, which we ought to observe in preferring one object to another This remark may, perhaps, serve to obviate difficulties, that may arise concerning some causes, which we here ascribe to particular passions, and which may be esteemed too refined to operate so universally and certainly, as they are found to do.

SECTION III.

I. IN running over all the causes, which produce the passion of pride or that of humility, it would readily occur, that the same circumstance, if transferred from ourselves to another person, would render him the object of love or hatred, esteem or contempt. The virtue, genius, beauty, family, riches, and authority of others, beget favourable sentiments in their behalf; and their vice, folly, deformity, poverty, and meanness, excite the contrary sentiments. The [illegible]

relation of impressions and ideas still operates on these passions of love and hatred, as on the former of pride and humility. Whatever gives a separate pleasure or pain, and is related to another person, or connected with him, makes him the object of our affection or disgust.

Hence, too, injury or contempt towards us is one of the greatest sources of our hatred; services or esteem, of our friendship.

2. Sometimes a relation to ourselves excites affection towards any person. But there is always here implied a relation of sentiments, without which the other relation would have no influence.*

A person who is related to us, or connected with us, by blood, by similitude of fortune, of adventures, profession, or country, soon becomes an agreeable companion to us, because we enter easily, and familiarly into his sentiments and conceptions: nothing is strange or new to us: our imagination, passing from self, which is ever intimately present to us, runs smoothly along the relation or connection, and conceives with a full sympathy the person who is nearly related to self. He renders himself immediately acceptable, and is at once on an easy footing with us: no distance, no reserve, has place, where the person introduced is supposed so closely connected with us.

Relation has here the same influence as custom or acquaintance, in exciting affection; and from like causes. The ease and satisfaction, which, in both cases, attend our intercourse or commerce, is the source of the friendship.

3. The passion of love and hatred are always followed by, or rather conjoined with, benevolence and anger. It is this conjunction which chiefly distinguishes these affections from pride and humility. For pride and humility are pure emotions in the soul, unattended with any desire, and not immediately exciting us to action. But love and hatred are not complete within themselves, nor rest in that emotion which they produce, but carry the mind to something farther. Love is always followed by a desire of happiness to the person beloved, and an aversion to his misery: as hatred produces a desire of the misery, and an aversion to the happiness of the person hated. These opposite desires seem to be originally and primarily conjoined with the passions of love and hatred. It is a constitution of nature, of which we can give no farther explication.

4. Compassion frequently arises where there is no preceding esteem or friendship; and compassion is an uneasiness in the sufferings of another. It seems to spring from the intimate and strong conception of his sufferings: and our imagination proceeds by degrees from the lively idea to the real feeling of another's misery.

* The affection of parents to children seems founded on an original instinct. The affection towards other relations depends on the principles here explained.

Malice and envy also arise in the mind without any preceding hatred or injury though their tendency is exactly the same with that of anger and ill-will. The comparison of ourselves with others seems to be the source of envy and malice The more unhappy another is, the more happy do we ourselves appear in our conception.

5 The similar tendency of compassion to that of benevolence, and envy to anger, forms a very close relation between these two sets of passions, thought of a different kind from that which was insisted on above. It is not a resemblaece of feeling or sentiment, but a resemblance of tendency or direction Its effect, however, is the same, in producing an association of passions Compassion is seldom or never felt without some mixture of tenderness or friendship and envy is naturally accompanied with anger or ill-will To desire the happiness of another, from whatever motive, is a good preparative to affection, and to delight in another's misery almost unavoidably begets aversion towards him

Even where interest is the source of our concern, it is commonly attended with the same consequences A partner is a natural object of friendship, a rival of enmity

6 Poverty, meanness, disappointment, produce contempt and dislike but when these misfortunes are very great, or are represented to us in very strong colours, they excite compassion, and tenderness, and friendship How is this contradiction to be accounted for? The poverty and meanness of another, in their common appearance, gives uneasiness, by a species of imperfect sympathy, and this uneasiness produces aversion or dislike from the resemblance of sentiment But when we enter more intimately into another's concerns, and wish for his happiness, as well as feel his misery, friendship or good-will arises from the similar tendency of the inclinations

A bankrupt, at first, while the idea of his misfortunes is fresh and recent, and while the comparison of his present unhappy situation with his former prosperity operates strongly upon us, meets with compassion and friendship After these ideas are weakened or obliterated by time, he is in danger of compassion and contempt

7 In respect, there is a mixture of humility, with the esteem or affection in contempt, a mixture of pride

The amorous passion is usually compounded of complacency in beauty, a bodily appetite, and friendship and affection. The close relation of these sentiments is very obvious, as well as their origin from each other, by means of that relation Were there no other phenomenon to reconcile us to the present theory, this alone, methinks, were sufficient

SECTION IV.

1. The present theory of the passions depends entirely on the double relations of sentiments and ideas, and the mutual assistance which these relations lend to each other It may not, therefore, be improper to illustrate these principles by some farther instances

2 The virtues, talents, accomplishments, and possessions of others, make us love and esteem them because these objects excite a pleasing sensation, which is related to love, and as they have also a relation or connection with the person, this union of ideas forwards the union of sentiments, according to the foregoing reasoning

But suppose, that the person, whom we love, is also related to us by blood, country, or friendship, it is evident, that a species of pride must also be excited by his accomplishments and possessions, there being the same double relation which we have all along insisted on. The person is related to us, or there is an easy transition of thought from him to us, and the sentiments excited by his advantages and virtues, are agreeable, and consequently related to pride Accordingly we find, that people are naturally vain of the good qualities or high fortune of their friends and countrymen.

3 But it is observable, that if we reverse the order of the passions the same effect does not follow We pass easily from love and affection to pride and vanity, but not from the latter passions to the former, though all the relations be the same We love not those who are related to us, on account of our own merit What is the reason of this difference? The transition of the imagination to ourselves, from objects related to us is always easy, though the former principle forwards the transition of thought, yet the latter opposes it, and consequently there is not the same easy transfusion of passions from pride to love as from love to pride.

4. The virtues, services, and fortune of one man inspire us readily with esteem and affection for another related to him The son of our friend is naturally entitled to our friendship the kindred of a very great man value themselves, and are valued by others, on account of that relation The force of the double relation is here fully displayed

5. The following are instances of another kind, where the operation of these principles may still be discovered. Envy arises from a superiority in others; but it is observable, that it is not the great disproportion between us, which excites that passion, but, on the contrary, our proximity. A great disproportion cuts off the relation of the ideas, and either keeps us from comparing ourselves with what is remote from us, or diminishes the effects of the comparison.

A poet is not apt to envy a philosopher, or a poet of a different kind, of a different nation, or of a different age. All these differences, if they do not prevent, at least weaken the comparison, and consequently the passion

This, too, is the reason why all objects appear great or little, merely by a comparison with those of the same species A mountain neither magnifies nor diminishes a horse in our eyes but when a Flemish and a Welsh horse are seen together, the one appears greater and the other less, than when viewed apart

From the same principle we may account for that remark of historians, that any party, in a civil war, or even factious divisions, always chuse to call in a foreign enemy at any hazard, rather than submit to their fellow-citizens Guicciardin applies this remark to the wars in Italy, where the relations between the different states are, properly speaking, nothing but of name, language, and contiguity. Yet even these relations, when joined with superiority, by making the comparison more natural, make it likewise more grievous, and cause men to search for some other superiority, which may be attended with no relation, and by that means may have a less sensible influence on the imagination When we cannot break the association, we feel a stronger desire to remove the superiority This seems to be the reason, why travellers, though commonly lavish of their praise to the Chinese and Persians, take care to depreciate those neighbouring nations, which may stand upon a footing of rivalship with their native country.

6. The fine arts afford us parallel instances Should an author compose a treatise, of which one part was serious and profound, another light and humorous, every one would condemn so strange a mixture, and would blame him for the neglect of all rules of art and criticism. Yet we accuse not Prior for joining his *Alma* and *Solomon* in the same volume, though that amiable poet has perfectly succeeded in the gaiety of the one, as well as in the melancholy of the other. Even suppose the reader should peruse these two compositions without any interval, he would feel little or no difficulty in the change of the passions. Why? but because he considers these performances as entirely different, and by that break in the ideas, breaks the progress of the affections, and hinders the one from influencing or contradicting the other

An heroic and burlesque design, united in one picture, would be monstrous, though we place two pictures of so opposite a character in the same chamber, and even close together, without any scruple.

7. It needs be no matter of wonder, that the easy [illegible] imagination should have such an influence on all the [illegible] is this very circumstance, which forms all the [illegible]

tions amongst objects. We know no real connection between one thing and another We only know, that the idea of one thing is associated with that of another, and that the imagination makes an easy transition between them And as the easy transition of ideas and that of sentiments mutually assist each other, we might beforehand expect, that this principle must have a mighty influence on all our internal movements and affections. Experience sufficiently confirms the theory.

For, not to repeat all the foregoing instances suppose that I were travelling with a companion through a country, to which we are both utter strangers, it is evident, that, if the prospects be beautiful, the roads agreeable, and the fields finely cultivated, this may serve to put me in good humour, both with myself and fellow-traveller. But as the country has no connection with myself or friend, it can never be the immediate cause either of self-value or of regard to him and therefore, if I found not the passion on some other object, which bears to one of us a closer relation, my emotions are rather to be considered as the overflowings of an elevated or humane disposition, than as an established passion But supposing the agreeable prospect before us to be surveyed, either from his country-seat or from mine, this new connection of ideas gives a new direction to the sentiment of pleasure derived from the prospect, and raises the emotion of regard or vanity according to the nature of the connection. There is not here, methinks, much room for doubt or difficulty.

SECTION V

1. IT seems evident, that reason, in a strict sense, as meaning the judgment of truth and falsehood, can never, of itself, be any motive to the will, and can have no influence but so far as it touches some passion or affection. *Abstract relations* of ideas are the object of curiosity, not of volition And *matters of fact*, where they are neither good nor evil, where they neither excite desire nor aversion, are totally indifferent, and whether known or unknown, whether mistaken or rightly apprehended, cannot be regarded as any motive to action.

2. What is commonly, in a popular sense, called reason, and is so much recommended in moral discourses, is nothing but a general and a calm passion, which takes a comprehensive and a distant view of its object, and actuates the will, without exciting any sensible emotion. A man, we say, is diligent in his profession from reason, that is, from a calm desire of riches and a fortune. A man adheres to justice from reason; that is, from a calm regard to public good, or to a character with himself and others.

3. The same objects which recommend themselves to reason in this sense of the word, are also the objects of what we call passion, when they are brought near to us, and acquire some other advantages, either of external situation, or congruity to our internal temper; and by that means excite a turbulent and sensible emotion. Evil, at a great distance, is avoided, we say, from reason: evil, near at hand, produces aversion, horror, fear, and is the object of passion.

4. The common error of metaphysicians has lain in ascribing the direction of the will entirely to one of these principles, and supposing the other to have no influence. Men often act knowingly against their interest: it is not therefore the view of the greatest possible good which always influences them. Men often counteract a violent passion, in prosecution of their distant interests and designs: it is not therefore the present uneasiness alone which determines them. In general, we may observe, that both these principles operate on the will; and where they are contrary, that either of them prevails, according to the general character or present disposition of the person. What we call *strength of mind* implies the prevalence of the calm passions above the violent; though we may easily observe, that there is no person so constantly possessed of this virtue, as never, on any occasion, to yield to the solicitation of violent affection and desire. From these variations of temper proceeds the great difficulty of deciding with regard to the future actions and resolutions of men, where there is any contrariety of motives and passions.

SECTION VI.

1. We shall here enumerate some of those circumstances which render a passion calm or violent, which heighten or diminish any emotion.

It is a property in human nature, that any emotion which attends a passion is easily converted into it; though in their natures they be originally different from, and even contrary to each other. It is true, in order to cause a perfect union amongst passions, and make one produce the other, there is always required a double relation, according to the theory above delivered. But when two passions are already produced by their separate causes, and are both present in the mind, they readily mingle and unite; though they have but one relation, and sometimes without any. The predominant passion swallows up the inferior, and converts it into itself. The spirits, when once excited, easily receive a change in their direction; and it is natural to imagine that this change will come from the prevailing affection. The connex-

tion is, in many cases, closer between any two passions, than between any passion and indifference.

When a person is once heartily in love, the little faults and caprices of his mistress, the jealousies and quarrels to which that affection is so subject, however unpleasant they be, and rather connected with anger and hatred, are yet found, in many instances, to give additional force to the prevailing passion. It is a common artifice of politicians, when they would affect any person very much by a matter of fact, of which they intend to inform him, first to excite his curiosity, delay as long as possible the satisfying of it, and by that means raise his anxiety and impatience to the utmost, before they give him a full insight into the business. They know that this curiosity will precipitate him into the passion which they purpose to raise, and will assist the object in its influence on the mind. A soldier advancing to battle is naturally inspired with courage and confidence when he thinks on his friends and fellow-soldiers, and is struck with fear and terror when he reflects on the enemy. Whatever new emotion, therefore, proceeds from the former, naturally increases the courage, as the same emotion proceeding from the latter, augments the fear. Hence in martial discipline, the uniformity and lustre of habit, the regularity of figures and motions, with all the pomp and majesty of war, encourage ourselves and our allies, while the same objects in the enemy strike terror into us, though agreeable and beautiful in themselves.

Hope is, in itself, an agreeable passion, and allied to friendship and benevolence, yet it is able sometimes to blow up anger, when that is the predominant passion. *Spes addita suscitat iras.* VIRG.

2. Since passions, however independent, are naturally transfused into each other, if they be both present at the same time, it follows, that when good or evil is placed in such a situation as to cause any particular emotion, besides its direct passion of desire or aversion, this latter passion must acquire new force and violence.

3. This often happens when any object excites contrary passions. For it is observable, that an opposition of passions commonly causes a new emotion in the spirits, and produces more disorders than the concurrence of any two affections of equal force. This new emotion is easily converted into the predominant passion, and, in many instances, is observed to increase its violence, beyond the pitch, at which it would have arrived, had it met with no opposition. Hence we naturally desire what is forbid, and often take pleasure in performing actions, merely because they are unlawful. The notion of duty, when opposite to the passions, is not always able to overcome them, and when it fails of that effect, is apt rather to increase and irritate them, by producing an opposition in our motives and principles.

4. The same effect follows, whether the opposition arise from internal

motives or external obstacles. The passion commonly acquires new force in both cases. The efforts, which the mind makes to surmount the obstacle, excite the spirits, and enliven the passions.

5 Uncertainty has the same effect as opposition. The agitation of the thought, the quick turns which it makes from one view to another, the variety of passions which succeed each other, according to the different views all these produce an emotion in the mind, and this emotion transfuses itself into the predominant passion

Security, on the contrary, diminishes the passions. The mind, when left to itself, immediately languishes, and in order to preserve its ardour, must be every moment supported by a new flow of passion. For the same reason, despair, though contrary to security, has a like influence

6 Nothing more powerfully excites any affection than to conceal some part of its object, by throwing it into a kind of shade, which, at the same time that it shows enough to prepossess us in favour of the object, leaves still some work for the imagination Besides, that obscurity is always attended with a kind of uncertainty, the effort, which the fancy makes to complete the idea, rouses the spirits, and gives an additional force to the passion

7 As despair and security, though contrary, produce the same effects, so absence is observed to have contrary effects, and in different circumstances, either increases or diminishes our affection. Rouchefoucault has very well remarked, that absence destroys weak passions, but increases strong, as the wind extinguishes a candle, but blows up a fire. Long absence naturally weakens our idea, and diminishes the passion but where the affection is so strong and lively as to support itself, the uneasiness arising from absence increases the passion, and gives it new force and influence

8 When the soul applies itself to the performance of any action, or the conception of any object, to which it is not accustomed, there is a certain unpliableness in the faculties, and a difficulty of the spirits moving in their new direction As this difficulty excites the spirits, it is the source of wonder, surprise, and of all the emotions which arise from novelty, and is, in itself, agreeable, like every thing which enlivens the mind to a moderate degree. But though surprise be agreeable in itself, yet, as it puts the spirits in agitation, it not only augments our agreeable affections, but also our painful, according to the foregoing principle. Hence every thing that is new is most affecting, and gives us either more pleasure or pain, than what, strictly speaking, should naturally follow from it. When it often returns upon us, the novelty wears off, the passions subside; the hurry of the spirits is over; and we survey the object with greater tranquillity.

9. The imagination and affections have a close union together. The vivacity of the former gives force to the latter. Hence the prospect

of any pleasure, with which we are acquainted, affects us more than any other pleasure, which we may own superior, but of whose nature we are *wholly* ignorant. Of the one we can form a particular and determinate idea the other we conceive under the general notion of pleasure.

Any satisfaction, which we lately enjoyed, and of which the memory is fresh and recent, operates on the will with more violence, than another of which the traces are decayed and almost obliterated.

A pleasure, which is suitable to the way of life in which we are engaged, excites more our desire and appetite than another, which is foreign to it.

Nothing is more capable of infusing any passion into the mind, than eloquence, by which objects are represented in the strongest and most lively colours The bare opinion of another, especially when enforced with passion, will cause an idea to have an influence upon us, though that idea might otherwise have been entirely neglected.

It is remarkable, that lively passions commonly attend a lively imagination In this respect, as well as in others, the force of the passion depends as much on the temper of the person, as on the nature and situation of the object

What is distant either in place or time, has not equal influence with what is near and contiguous

* * * * * * * *

I pretend not to have here exhausted this subject. It is sufficient for my purpose, if I have made it appear, that, in the production and conduct of the passions, there is a certain regular mechanism, which is susceptible of as accurate a disquisition, as the laws of motion, optics, hydrostatics, or any part of natural philosophy.

ESSAY XLI—AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PRINCIPLES OF MORALS.

SECTION I.—OF THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF MORALS.

Disputes with men, pertinaciously obstinate in their principles, are, of all others, the most irksome, except, perhaps, those with persons entirely disingenuous, who really do not believe the opinion they defend, but engage in the controversy, from affectation, from a spirit of opposition, or from a desire of showing wit and ingenuity superior to the rest of mankind. The same blind adherence to their own arguments is to be expected in both; the same contempt of their antagonists; and

the same passionate vehemence in enforcing sophistry and falsehood. And as reasoning is not the source whence either disputant derives his tenets, it is in vain to expect, that any logic, which speaks not to the affections, will ever engage him to embrace sounder principles

Those who have denied the reality of moral distinctions, may be ranked among the disingenuous disputants nor is it conceivable, that any human creature could ever seriously believe, that all characters and actions were alike entitled to the affection and regard of every one The difference which nature has placed between one man and another, is so wide, and this difference is still so much farther widened by education, example, and habit, that, where the opposite extremes come at once under our apprehension, there is no scepticism so scrupulous, and scarce any assurance so determined, as absolutely to deny all distinction between them Let a man's insensibility be ever so great, he must often be touched with the images of RIGHT and WRONG, and let his prejudices be ever so obstinate, he must observe, that others are susceptible of like impressions The only way, therefore, of converting an antagonist of this kind is to leave him to himself For, finding that nobody keeps up the controversy with him, it is probable he will, at last, of himself, from mere weariness, come over to the side of common sense and reason

There has been a controversy started of late, much better worth examination, concerning the general foundation of MORALS, whether they be derived from REASON or from SENTIMENT, whether we attain the knowledge of them by a chain of argument and induction, or by an immediate feeling and finer internal sense, whether, like all sound judgment of truth and falsehood, they should be the same to every rational intelligent being, or whether, like the perception of beauty and deformity, they be founded entirely on the particular fabric and constitution of the human species

The ancient philosophers, though they often affirm, that virtue is nothing but conformity to reason, yet, in general, seem to consider morals as deriving their existence from taste and sentiment On the other hand, our modern inquirers, though they also talk much of the beauty of virtue, and deformity of vice, yet have commonly endeavoured to account for these distinctions by metaphysical reasonings, and by deductions from the most abstract principles of the understanding Such confusion reigned in these subjects, that an opposition of the greatest consequence could prevail between one system and another, and even in the parts of almost each individual system, and yet nobody, till very lately, was ever sensible of it. The elegant Lord Shaftesbury, who first gave occasion to remark this distinction, and who, in general, adhered to the principles of the ancients, is not, himself, entirely free from the same confusion.

It must be acknowledged, that both sides of the question are susceptible of specious arguments Moral distinctions, it may be said, are discernible by pure *reason* else, whence the many disputes that reign in common life, as well as in philosophy, with regard to this subject the long chain of proofs often produced on both sides, the examples cited, the authorities appealed to, the analogies employed, the fallacies detected, the inferences drawn, and the several conclusions adjusted to their proper principles. Truth is disputable, not taste. what exists in the nature of things is the standard of our judgment, what each man feels within himself is the standard of sentiment Propositions in geometry may be proved, systems in physics may be controverted, but the harmony of verse, the tenderness of passion, the brilliancy of wit, must give immediate pleasure No man reasons concerning another's beauty, but frequently concerning the justice or injustice of his actions In every criminal trial, the first object of the prisoner is to disprove the facts alleged, and deny the actions imputed to him the second, to prove that, even if these actions were real, they might be justified as innocent and lawful It is confessedly by deductions of the understanding, that the first point is ascertained how can we suppose that a different faculty of the mind is employed in fixing the other?

On the other hand, those who would resolve all moral determinations into *sentiment*, may endeavour to show, that it is impossible for reason ever to draw conclusions of this nature To virtue, say they, it belongs to be *amiable*, and vice *odious* This forms their very nature or essence But can reason or argumentation distribute these different epithets to any subjects, and pronounce before-hand, that this must produce love, and that hatred? Or what other reason can we ever assign for these affections, but the original fabric and formation of the human mind, which is naturally adapted to receive them?

The end of all moral speculations is to teach us our duty, and, by proper representations of the deformity of vice and beauty of virtue, beget correspondent habits, and engage us to avoid the one, and embrace the other But is this ever to be expected from inferences and conclusions of the understanding, which of themselves have no hold of the affections, or set in motion the active powers of men? They discover truths but where the truths which they discover are indifferent, and beget no desire or aversion, they can have no influence on conduct and behaviour What is honourable, what is fair, what is becoming, what is noble, what is generous, takes possession of the heart, and animates us to embrace and maintain it. What is intelligible, what is evident, what is probable, what is true, procures only the cool assent of the understanding, and gratifying a speculative curiosity, puts an end to our researches.

Extinguish all the warm feeling and prepossessions in favour of

virtue, and all disgust or aversion to vice; render men totally indifferent towards these distinctions; and morality is no longer a practical study, nor has any tendency to regulate our lives and actions.

These arguments on each side (and many more might be produced) are so plausible, that I am apt to suspect, they may, the one as well as the other, be solid and satisfactory, and that *reason* and *sentiment* concur in almost all moral determinations and conclusions. The final sentence, it is probable, which pronounces characters and actions amiable, or odious, praiseworthy or blameable; that which stamps on them the mark of honour or infamy, approbation or censure; that which renders morality an active principle, and constitutes virtue our happiness, and vice our misery: it is probable, I say, that this final sentence depends on some internal sense or feeling, which nature has made universal in the whole species. For what else can have an influence of this nature? But in order to pave the way for such a sentiment, and give a proper discernment of its object, it is often necessary, we find, that much reasoning should precede, that nice distinctions be made, just conclusions drawn, distant comparisons formed, complicated relations examined, and general facts fixed and ascertained. Some species of beauty, especially the natural kinds, on their first appearance, command our affection and approbation; and where they fail of this effect, it is impossible for any reasoning to redress their influence, or adapt them better to our taste and sentiment. But in many orders of beauty, particularly those of the finer arts, it is requisite to employ much reasoning, in order to feel the proper sentiment; and a false relish may frequently be corrected by argument and reflection. There are just grounds to conclude that moral beauty partakes much of this latter species, and demands the assistance of our intellectual faculties, in order to give it a suitable influence on the human mind.

But though this question, concerning the general principles of morals, be curious and important, it is needless for us, at present, to employ farther care in our researches concerning it. For if we can be so happy, in the course of this inquiry, as to discover the true origin of morals, it will then easily appear how far either sentiment or reason enters into all determinations of this nature. [Appendix I.] In order to attain this purpose, we shall endeavour to follow a very simple method: we shall analyze that complication of mental qualities, which form what, in common life, we call PERSONAL MERIT: we shall consider every attribute of the mind, which renders a man an object either of esteem and affection, or of hatred and contempt; every habit or sentiment or faculty, which, if ascribed to any person, implies either praise or blame, and may enter into any panegyric or satire of his character and manners. The quick sensibility, which, in this kind,

is so universal among mankind, gives a philosopher sufficient assurance, that he can never be considerably mistaken in framing the catalogue, or incur any danger of misplacing the objects of his contemplation: he needs only enter into his own breast for a moment, and consider whether or not he should desire to have this or that quality ascribed to him, and whether such or such an imputation would proceed from a friend or an enemy. The very nature of language guides us almost infallibly in forming a judgment of this nature; and as every tongue possesses one set of words which are taken in a good sense, and another in the opposite, the least acquaintance with the idiom suffices, without any reasoning, to direct us in collecting and arranging the estimable or blameable qualities of men. The only object of reasoning is to discover the circumstances on both sides, which are common to these qualities, to observe that particular in which the estimable qualities agree on the one hand, and the blameable on the other, and thence to reach the foundation of ethics, and find those universal principles, from which all censure or approbation is ultimately derived. As this is a question of fact, not of abstract science, we can only expect success by following the experimental method, and deducing general maxims from a comparison of particular instances. The other scientifical method, where a general abstract principle is first established, and is afterwards branched out into a variety of inferences and conclusions, may be more perfect in itself, bnt suits less the imperfection of human nature, and is a common source of allusion and mistake, in this as well as in other subjects. Men are now cured of their passion for hypotheses and systems in natural philosophy, and will hearken to no arguments but those which are derived from experience. It is full time they should attempt a like reformation in all moral disquisitions, and reject every system of ethics, however subtile or ingenious, which is not founded on fact and observation.

We shall begin our inquiry on this head by the consideration of the social virtues, Benevolence and Justice: the explication of them will probably give us an opening, by which the others may be accounted for.

SECTION II.—OF BENEVOLENCE.

PART I.—It may be esteemed, perhaps, a superfluous task to prove that the benevolent or softer affections are ESTIMABLE; and, wherever they appear, engage the approbation and good-will of mankind. The epithets, *sociable*, *good natured*, *humane*, *merciful*, *grateful*, *friendly*, *generous*, *beneficent*, or their equivalents, are known

in all languages, and universally express the highest merit which human nature is capable of attaining Where these amiable qualities are attended with birth and power, and eminent abilities, and display themselves in the good government or useful instruction of mankind, they seem even to raise the possessors of them above the *rank of human nature*, and make them approach, in some measure, to the divine Exalted capacity, undaunted courage, prosperous success, these may only expose a hero or politician to the envy and ill-will of the public but as soon as the praises are added of humane and beneficent, when instances are displayed of lenity, tenderness, or friendship; envy itself is silent, or joins the general voice of approbation and applause

When Pericles, the great Athenian statesman and general, was on his death bed, his surrounding friends, deeming him now insensible, began to indulge their sorrow for their expiring patron, by enumerating his great qualities and success, his conquests and victories, the unusual length of his administration, and his nine trophies erected over the enemies of the republic *You forget*, cries the dying hero, who had heard all, *you forget the most eminent of my praises, while you dwell so much on those vulgar advantages in which fortune had a principal share You have not observed, that no citizen has ever yet worn mourning on my account* [Plutarch in Pericles]

In men of more ordinary talents and capacity, the social virtues become, if possible, still more essentially requisite, there being nothing eminent, in that case, to compensate for the want of them, or preserve the person from our severest hatred, as well as contempt. A high ambition, an elevated courage, is apt, says Cicero, in less perfect characters, to degenerate into a turbulent ferocity The more social and softer virtues are there chiefly to be regarded These are always good and amiable [Cic de Officiis, lib I]

The principal advantage which Juvenal discovers in the extensive capacity of the human species, is, that it renders our benevolence also more extensive, and gives us larger opportunities of spreading our kindly influence than what are indulged to the inferior creator. [Sat xv. 139. et seq] It must, indeed, be confessed, that by doing good only, can a man truly enjov the advantages of being eminent. His exalted station, of itself, but the more exposes him to danger and tempest His sole prerogative is to afford shelter to inferiors, who repose themselves under his cover and protection

But I forget that it is not my present business to re-abstain from some sally of panegyric, as often as they occur in their true colours, all the genuine charms of the social virtues. These, indeed, sufficiently engage every heart, on the first apprehension of them; and it is difficult to abstain from some sally of panegyric as often as they

occur in discourse or reasoning. But our object here being more the speculative, than the practical part of morals, it will suffice to remark (what will readily, I believe, be allowed), that no qualities are more entitled to the general good-will and approbation of mankind than beneficence and humanity, friendship and gratitude, natural affection and public spirit, or whatever proceeds from a tender sympathy with others, and a generous concern for our kind and our species. These, wherever they appear, seem to transfuse themselves, in a manner into each beholder, and call forth, in their own behalf, the favourable and affectionate sentiments which they exert on all around

PART II —We may observe, that in displaying the praises of any humane, beneficent man, there is one circumstance which never fails to be amply insisted on, namely, the happiness and satisfaction, derived to society from his intercourse and good offices To his parents, we are apt to say, he endears himself by his pious attachment and duteous care, still more than by the connections of nature His children never feel his authority, but when employed for their advantage With him, the ties of love are consolidated by beneficence and friendship The ties of friendship approach, in a fond observance of each obliging office, to those of love and inclination His domestics and dependents have in him a sure resource, and no longer dread the power of Fortune, but so far as she exercises it over him From him the hungry receive food, the naked clothing, the ignorant and slothful skill and industry Like the sun, an inferior minister of Providence, he cheers, invigorates, and sustains the surrounding world

If confined to private life, the sphere of his activity is narrower; but his influence is all benign and gentle If exalted into a higher station, mankind and posterity reap the fruit of his labours.

As these topics of praise never fail to be employed, and with success, where we would inspire esteem for any one, may it not thence be concluded, that the UTILITY, resulting from the social virtues, forms, at least, a *part* of their merit, and is one source of that approbation and regard so universally paid to them

When we recommend even an animal or a plant as *useful* and *beneficial*, we give it an applause and recommendation suited to its nature. As, on the other hand, reflection on the baneful influence of any of these inferior beings always inspires us with the sentiment of aversion. The eye is pleased with the prospect of corn-fields and loaded vineyards; horses grazing, and flocks pasturing but flies the view of briars and brambles, affording shelter to wolves and to serpents.

A machine, a piece of furniture, a vestment, a house well contrived for use and conveniency, is so far beautiful, and

contemplated with pleasure and approbation. An experienced [illegible] is here sensible to many excellencies which escape persons ignora and uninstructed.

Can any thing stronger be said in praise of a profession, su as merchandize or manufacture, than to observe the advantag which it procures to society? And is not a monk and inquisit enraged when we treat his order as useless or as pernicio to mankind?

The historian exults in displaying the benefit arising from h labours. The writer of romance alleviates or denies the bad cons quences ascribed to his manner of composition

In general, what praise is implied in the simple epithet *usefu* What reproach in the contrary!

Your gods, says Cicero [De Nat. Deor lib i.] in opposition to th Epicureans, cannot justly claim any worship or adoration, wi whatever imaginary perfections you may suppose them endowe They are totally useless and unactive Even the EGYPTIANS, who you so much ridicule, never consecrated any animal but on accou of its utility

The sceptics assert, [Sext Emp adversus Math lib viii.] thoug absurdly, that the origin of all religious worship was derived fro the utility of inanimate objects, as the sun and moon to the suppo and well-being of mankind This is also the common reaso assigned by historians for the deification of eminent heroes an legislators. [Diod. Sic passim.]

To plant a tree, to cultivate a field, to beget children; are mer torious acts, according to the religion of Zoroaster.

In all determinations of morality, this circumstance of publ utility is ever principally in view, and wherever disputes aris either in philosophy or common life, concerning the bounds of dut the question cannot, by any means, be decided with greater certaint than by ascertaining, on any side, the true interests of mankind. any false opinion, embraced from appearances, has been found t prevail, as soon as farther experience and sounder reasoning hav given us juster notions of human affairs, we retract our first sent ment, and adjust anew the boundaries of moral good and evil.

Giving alms to common beggars is naturally praised; becau it seems to carry relief to the distressed and indigent: but whe we observe the encouragement thence arising to idleness an debauchery, we regard that species of charity rather as a weakne than a virtue.

Tyrannicide, or the assassination of usurpers and oppressive prince was highly extolled in ancient times, because it both freed mankin from many of these monsters, and seemed to keep the others in aw whom the sword or poinard could not reach. But history an

experience having since convinced us, that this practice increases the jealousies and cruelty of princes, a TIMOLEON and a BRUTUS, though treated with indulgence on account of the prejudices of their times, are now considered as very improper models for imitation.

Liberality in princes is regarded as a mark of beneficence but when it occurs, that the homely bread of the honest and industrious is often thereby converted into delicious ease for the idle and the prodigal, we soon retract our heedless praises The regrets of a prince, for having lost a day, were noble and generous, but had he intended to have spent it in acts of generosity to his greedy courtiers it was better lost than misemployed after that manner

Luxury, or a refinement on the pleasures and conveniencies of life, had long been supposed the source of every corruption in government, and the immediate cause of faction, sedition, civil wars, and the total loss of liberty It was, therefore, universally regarded as a vice, and was an object of declamation to all satirists and severe moralists. Those who prove, or attempt to prove, that such refinements rather tend to the increase of industry, civility, and arts, regulate anew our *moral* as well as *political* sentiments, and represent, as laudable or innocent, what had formerly been regarded as pernicious and blameable.

Upon the whole then, it seems undeniable, *that* nothing can bestow more merit on any human creature than the sentiment of benevolence in an eminent degree, and *that* a *part*, at least, of its merit, arises from its tendency to promote the interests of our species, and bestow happiness on human society We carry our view into the salutary consequences of such a character and disposition, and whatever has so benign an influence, and forwards so desirable an end, is beheld with complacency and pleasure The social virtues are never regarded without their beneficial tendencies, nor viewed as barren and unfruitful. The happiness of mankind, the order of society, the harmony of families, the mutual support of friends, are always considered as the result of the gentle dominion over the breasts of men.

How considerable a *part* of their merit we ought to ascribe to their utility, will better appear from future disquisitions [Sect. III and IV.], as well as the reason why this circumstance has such a command over our esteem and approbation. [Sect. V.]

SECTION III.—OF JUSTICE.

PART I.—That Justice is useful to society, and consequently that part of its merit, at least, must arise from that consideration, it would be

a superfluous undertaking to prove. That public utility is the sole origin of Justice, and that reflections on the beneficial consequences of this virtue are the *sole* foundation of its merit; this proposition, being more curious and important, will better deserve our examination and inquiry.

Let us suppose, that nature has bestowed on the human race such profuse *abundance* of all *external* conveniences, that, without any uncertainty in the event, without any care or industry on our part, every individual finds himself fully provided with whatever his most voracious appetites can want, or luxurious imagination wish or desire. His natural beauty, we shall suppose, surpasses all acquired ornaments: the perpetual clemency of the seasons renders useless all clothes or covering: the raw herbage affords him the most delicious fare; the clear fountain, the richest beverage. No laborious occupation required: no tillage: no navigation. Music, poetry, and contemplation, form his sole business: conversation, mirth, and friendship, his sole amusement.

It seems evident, that, in such a happy state, every other social virtue would flourish, and receive tenfold increase; but the cautious, jealous virtue of justice, would never once have been dreamed of. For what purpose make a partition of goods, where every one has already more than enough? Why give rise to property, where there cannot possibly be any injury? Why call this object *mine*, when, upon the seizing of it by another, I need but stretch out my hand to possess myself of what is equally valuable? Justice, in that case, being totally USELESS, would be an idle ceremonial, and could never possibly have place in the catalogue of virtues.

We see even in the present necessitous condition of mankind, that, wherever any benefit is bestowed by nature in an unlimited abundance, we have it always in common among the whole human race, and make no subdivisions of right and property. Water and air, though the most necessary of all objects, are not challenged as the property of individuals; nor can any man commit injustice by the most lavish use and enjoyment of these blessings. In fertile extensive countries, with few inhabitants land is regarded on the same footing. And no topic is so much insisted on by those who defend the liberty of the seas, as the unexhausted use of them in navigation. Were the advantages, procured by navigation, as inexhaustible, these reasoners had never had any adversaries to refute; nor had any claims ever been advanced of a separate, exclusive dominion, over the ocean.

It may happen, in some countries, at some periods, that there be established a property in water, none in land [Genesis, chap. xiii. and xxi.], if the latter be in greater abundance than can be used by the inhabitants, and the former be found, with difficulty, and in very small quantities.

Again; suppose, that, though the necessities of the human race continue the same as at present, yet the mind is so enlarged, and so replete with friendship and generosity, that every man has the utmost tenderness for every man, and feels no more concern for his own interest than for that of his fellows: it seems evident, that the USE of Justice would, in this case, be suspended by such an extensive benevolence, nor would the divisions and barriers of property and obligation have ever been thought of. Why should I bind another, by a deed or promise, to do me any good office, when I know that he is already prompted, by the strongest inclination, to seek my happiness, and would, of himself, perform the desired service; except the hurt, he thereby receives, be greater than the benefit accruing to me: in which case he knows, that, from my innate humanity and friendship, I should be the first to oppose myself to his imprudent generosity. Why raise land-marks between my neighbour's field and mine, when my heart has made no division between our interests; but shares all his joys and sorrows with the same force and vivacity as if originally my own! Every man, upon this supposition, being a second self to another, would trust all his interests to the discretion of every man; without jealousy, without partition, without distinction. And the whole human race would form only one family; where all would lie in common, and be used freely, without regard to property; but cautiously too, with as entire regard to the necessities of each individual, as if our own interests were most intimately concerned.

In the present disposition of the human heart, it would, perhaps, be difficult to find complete instances of such enlarged affections; but still we may observe, that the case of families approaches towards it; and the stronger the mutual benevolence is among the individuals, the nearer it approaches; till all distinction of property be, in a great measure, lost and confounded among them. Between married persons, the cement of friendship is by the laws supposed so strong as to abolish all division of possessions, and has often, in reality, the force ascribed to it. And it is observable, that, during the ardour of new enthusiasms, when every principle is inflamed into extravagance, the community of goods has frequently been attempted; and nothing but experience of its inconveniences, from the returning or disguised selfishness of men, could make the imprudent fanatics adopt anew the ideas of justice and of separate property. So true is it that this virtue derives its existence entirely from its necessary *use* to the intercourse and social state of mankind.

To make this truth more evident, let us reverse the foregoing suppositions; and, carrying every thing to the opposite extreme, consider what would be the effect of these new situations. Suppose a society to fall into such want of all common necessaries, that the utmost frugality and industry cannot preserve the greater number from perish-

ing

ing, and the whole from extreme misery: it will readily, I believe, be admitted, that the strict laws of justice are suspended, in such a pressing emergence, and give place to the stronger motives of necessity and self-preservation. Is it any crime, after a shipwreck, to seize whatever means or instrument of safety one can lay hold of, without regard to former limitations of property? Or if a city besieged were perishing with hunger; can we imagine, that men will see any means of preservation before them, and lose their lives, from a scrupulous regard to what, in other situations, would be the rules of equity and justice? The USE and TENDENCY of that virtue is to procure happiness and security, by preserving order in society: but where the society is ready to perish from extreme necessity, no greater evil can be dreaded from violence and injustice; and every man may now provide for himself by all the means, which prudence can dictate, or humanity permit. The public, even in less urgent necessities, opens granaries, without the consent of proprietors; as justly supposing, that the authority of magistracy may, consistent with equity, extend so far: but were any number of men to assemble, without the tie of laws or civil jurisdiction; would an equal partition of bread in a famine, though effected by power and even violence, be regarded as criminal or injurious?

Suppose, likewise, that it should be a virtuous man's fate to fall into the society of ruffians; remote from the protection of laws and government; what conduct must he embrace in that melancholy situation? He sees such a desperate rapaciousness prevail; such a disregard to equity, such contempt of order, such stupid blindness to future consequences, as must immediately have the most tragical conclusion, and must terminate in destruction to the greater number, and in a total dissolution of society to the rest. He, mean while, can have no other expedient than to arm himself to whomsoever the sword he seizes, or the buckler, may belong: to make provision of all means of defence and security: and his particular regard to justice being no longer of USE to his own safety or that of others, he must consult the dictates of self-preservation alone, without concern for those who no longer merit his care and attention.

When any man, even in political society, renders himself, by his crimes, obnoxious to the public, he is punished by the laws in his goods and person; that is, the ordinary rules of justice are, with regard to him, suspended for a moment; and it becomes equitable to inflict on him, for the *benefit* of society, what, otherwise, he could not suffer without wrong or injury.

The rage and violence of public war; what is it but a suspension of justice among the warring parties, who perceive, that this virtue is now no longer of any *use* or advantage to them? The laws of war, which then succeed to those of equity and justice, are [illegible]

for the *advantage* and *utility* of that particular state, in which men are now placed. And were a civilized nation engaged with barbarians, who observed no rules even of war, the former must also suspend their observance of them, where they no longer serve to any purpose, and must render every action or rencounter as bloody and pernicious as possible to the first aggressors.

Thus, the rules of equity or justice depend entirely on the particular state and condition, in which men are placed, and owe their origin and existence to that UTILITY, which results to the public from their strict and regular observance. Reverse, in any considerable circumstance, the condition of men: produce extreme abundance or extreme necessity: implant in the human breast perfect moderation and humanity, or perfect rapaciousness and malice: by rendering justice totally *useless*, you thereby totally destroy its essence, and suspend its obligation upon mankind.

The common situation of society is a medium amidst all these extremes. We are naturally partial to ourselves, and to our friends, but are capable of learning the advantage resulting from a more equitable conduct. Few enjoyments are given us from the open and liberal hand of nature; but by art, labour, and industry, we can extract them in great abundance. Hence the ideas of property become necessary in all civil society: hence justice derives its usefulness to the public: and hence alone arises its merit and moral obligation.

These conclusions are so natural and obvious, that they have not escaped even the poets, in their descriptions of the felicity attending the golden age or the reign of Saturn. The seasons, in that first period of nature, were so temperate, if we credit these agreeable fictions, that there was no necessity for men to provide themselves with clothes and houses, as a security against the violence of heat and cold: the rivers flowed with wine and milk: the oaks yielded honey: and nature spontaneously produced her greatest delicacies. Nor were these the chief advantages of that happy age. Tempests were not alone removed from nature, but those more furious tempests were unknown to human breasts, which now cause such uproar, and engender such confusion. Avarice, ambition, cruelty, selfishness, were never heard of: cordial affection, compassion, sympathy, were the only movements with which the mind was yet acquainted. Even the punctilious distinction of *mine* and *thine* was banished from among that happy race of mortals, and carried with it the very notion of property and obligation, justice and injustice.

This *poetical* fiction of the *golden age* is, in some respects, of a piece with the *philosophical* fiction of the *state of nature*, only that the former is represented as the most charming and most peaceable condition, which can possibly be imagined; whereas the latter is painted out as a state of mutual war and violence, attended with the most ex-

treme necessity. On the first origin of mankind, we are told, their ignorance and savage nature were so prevalent, that they could give no mutual trust, but must each depend upon himself, and his own force or cunning for protection and security. No law was heard of: no rule of justice known: no distinction of property regarded: power was the only measure of right; and a perpetual war of all against all was the result of men's untamed selfishness and barbarity.*

Whether such a condition of human nature could ever exist, or if it did, could continue so long as to merit the appellation of a state, may justly be doubted. Men are necessarily born in a family-society at least; and are trained up by their parents to some rule of conduct and behaviour. But this must be admitted, that, if such a state of mutual war and violence was ever real, the suspension of all laws of justice, from their absolute inutility, is a necessary and infallible consequence.

The more we vary our views of human life, and the newer and more unusual the lights are, in which we survey it, the more shall we be convinced, that the origin here assigned for the virtue of justice is real and satisfactory.

Were there a species of creatures intermingled with men, which, though rational, were possessed of such inferior strength, both of body and mind, that they were incapable of all resistance, and could never, upon the highest provocation, make us feel the effects of their resentment; the necessary consequence, I think, is, that we should be bound, by the laws of humanity, to give gentle usage to these creatures, but should not, properly speaking, lie under any restraint of justice with regard to them, nor could they possess any right or property, exclusive of such arbitrary lords. Our intercourse with them could not be called society, which supposes a degree of equality; but absolute command on the one side, and servile obedience on the other. Whatever we covet, they must instantly resign. Our permission is the only tenure, by which they hold their possessions: our compassion and kindness the only check, by which they curb our lawless will: and as no inconvenience ever results from the exercise of a power, so

* This fiction of a state of nature, as a state of war, was not first started by Mr. Hobbes, as is commonly imagined. Plato endeavours to refute an hypothesis very like it in the 2d, 3d, and 4th books de republica. Cicero, on the contrary, supposes it certain and universally acknowledged in the following passage. 'Quis enim vestrum, judices, ignorat, ita naturam 'rerum tulisse, ut quodam tempore homines, nondum neque naturali, neque civili jure 'descripto fusi per agros, ac dispersi vagarentur tantumque haberent quantum manu ac 'viribus, per caedem ac vulnera, aut eripere, aut retinere potuissent? Qui igitur primi 'virtute et consilio praestanti extiterunt, ii perspecto genere humanae docilitatis atque ingenii, 'dissipatos, unum in locum congregarunt, eosque ex feritate illa ad justitiam ac mansuetu-'dinem transduxerunt. Tum res ad communem utilitatem, quas publicas appellamus, tum 'conventicula hominum, quae postea civitates nominatae sunt, tum domicilia conjuncta, quas 'urbes dicamus, invento et divino et humano jure, moenibus sepserunt. Atque inter hanc 'vitam, perpolitam humanitate, et illam immanem, nihil tam interest quam JUS atque VIS. 'Horum utro uti nolimus, altero est utendum. Vim volumus extingui? Jus valeat necesse 'est, id est, judicia, quibus omne jus continetur. Judicia displicent, aut nulla sunt? Vis 'dominetur necesse est? Haec vident omnes.'—Pro Sext. l. 42.

firmly established in nature, the restraints of justice and property, being totally *useless*, would never have place in so unequal a confederacy.

This is plainly the situation of men with regard to animals, and how far these may be said to possess reason, I leave it to others to determine The great superiority of civilized Europeans above barbarous Indians, tempted us to imagine ourselves on the same footing with regard to them, and made us throw off all restraints of justice, and even of humanity, in our treatment of them In many nations, the female sex are reduced to like slavery, and are rendered incapable of all property, in opposition to their lordly masters But though the males, when united, have, in all countries, bodily force sufficient to maintain this severe tyranny, yet such are the insinuation, address, and charms of their fair companions, that women are commonly able to break the confederacy, and share with the other sex in all the rights and privileges of society

Were the human species so framed by nature as that each individual possessed within himself every faculty, requisite both for his own preservation, and for the propagation of his kind were all society and intercourse cut off between man and man, by the primary intention of the Supreme Creator it seems evident, that so solitary a being would be as much incapable of justice, as of social discourse and conversation. Where mutual regards and forbearance serve to no manner of purpose, they would never direct the conduct of any reasonable man. The headlong course of the passions would be checked by no reflection on future consequences And as each man is here supposed to love himself alone, and to depend only on himself and his own activity for safety and happiness, he would, on every occasion, to the utmost of his power, challenge the preference above every other being, to none of which he is bound by any ties, either of nature or of interest.

But suppose the conjunction of the sexes to be established in nature, a family immediately arises, and particular rules being found requisite for its subsistence, these are immediately embraced, though without comprehending the rest of mankind within their prescriptions. Suppose that several families unite together into one society, which is totally disjoined from all others, the rules which preserve peace and order enlarge themselves to the utmost extent of that society, but becoming then entirely useless, lose their force when carried one step farther. But again, suppose that several distinct societies maintain a kind of intercourse for mutual convenience and advantage, the boundaries of justice still grow larger, in proportion to the largeness of men's views, and the force of their mutual connections History, experience, reason, sufficiently instruct us in this natural progress of human sentiments, and in the gradual enlargement of our regards to

justice, in proportion as we become acquainted with the extensive utility of that virtue.

PART II.—If we examine the *particular* laws by which justice is directed, and property determined, we shall still be presented with the same conclusion. The good of mankind is the only object of all these laws and regulations. Not only is it requisite, for the peace and interest of society, that men's possessions should be separated; but the rules which we follow, in making the separation, are such as can best be contrived to serve farther the interests of society.

We shall suppose, that a creature possessed of reason, but unacquainted with human nature, deliberates with himself what RULES of justice or property would best promote public interest, and establish peace and security among mankind: his most obvious thought would be, to assign the largest possession to the most extensive virtue, and give every one the power of doing good, proportioned to his inclination. In a perfect theocracy, where a being infinitely intelligent, governs by particular volitions, this rule would certainly have place, and might serve to the wisest purposes: but were mankind to execute such a law, so great is the uncertainty of merit, both from its natural obscurity, and from the self-conceit of each individual, that no determinate rule of conduct would ever result from it; and the total dissolution of society must be the immediate consequence. Fanatics may suppose, *that dominion is founded on grace*, and *that saints alone inherit the earth*; but the civil magistrate very justly puts these sublime theorists on the same footing with common robbers, and teaches them, by the severest discipline, that a rule, which in speculation may seem the most advantageous to society, may yet be found in practice totally pernicious and destructive.

That there were *religious* fanatics of this kind in England, during the civil wars, we learn from history; though it is probable that the obvious *tendency* of these principles excited such horror in mankind, as soon obliged the dangerous enthusiasts to renounce, or at least conceal their tenets. Perhaps the *levellers* who claimed an equal distribution of property, were a kind of *political* fanatics, which arose from the religious species, and more openly avowed their pretensions; as carrying a more plausible appearance, of being practicable in themselves, as well as useful to human society.

It must, indeed, be confessed, that nature is so liberal to mankind, that, were all her presents equally divided among the species, and improved by art and industry, every individual would enjoy all the necessaries, and even most of the comforts of life; nor would ever be liable to any ills, but such as might accidentally arise from the sickly frame and constitution of his body. It must also be confessed, that wherever we depart from this equality, we rob the poor of more satis-

satisfaction than we add to the rich; and that the slight gratification of a frivolous vanity, in one individual, frequently costs more than bread to many families, and even provinces. It may appear withal, that the rule of equality, as it would be highly *useful*, is not altogether *impracticable*; but has taken place, at least in an imperfect degree, in some republics, particularly that of Sparta, where it was attended, it is said, with the most beneficial consequences. Not to mention, that the AGRARIAN laws, so frequently claimed in Rome, and carried into execution in many Greek cities, proceeded, all of them, from the general idea of the utility of this principle

But historians, and even common sense, may inform us, that however specious these ideas of *perfect* equality may seem, they are really at bottom *impracticable*, and were they not so, would be extremely *pernicious* to human society Render possessions ever so equal, men's different degrees of art, care, and industry, will immediately break that equality Or if you check these virtues, you reduce society to the most extreme indigence, and, instead of preventing want and beggary in a few, render it unavoidable to the whole community The most rigorous inquisition, too, is requisite to watch every inequality on its first appearance, and the most severe jurisdiction, to punish and redress it But besides, that so much authority must soon degenerate into tyranny, and be exerted with great partialities, who can possibly be possessed of it, in such a situation as is here supposed? Perfect equality of possessions, destroying all subordination, weakens extremely the authority of magistracy, and must reduce all power nearly to a level, as well as property

We may conclude, therefore, that, in order to establish laws for the regulation of property, we must be acquainted with the nature and situation of man, must reject appearances, which may be false, though specious, and must search for those rules, which are, on the whole, most *useful* and *beneficial* vulgar sense and slight experience are sufficient for this purpose, where men give not way to too selfish avidity, or too extensive enthusiasm.

Who sees not, for instance, that whatever is produced or improved by man's art or industry, ought for ever to be secured to him, in order to give encouragement to such *useful* habits and accomplishments? That the property ought also to descend to children and relations, for the same *useful* purpose? That it may be alienated by consent, in order to beget that commerce and intercourse which is so *beneficial* to human society? And that all contracts and promises ought carefully to be fulfilled, in order to secure mutual trust and confidence, by which the general *interest* of mankind is so much promoted?

Examine the writers on the laws of nature, and you will always find, that whatever principles they set out with, they are sure to terminate here at last, and to assign, as the ultimate reason for every rule

which they establish, the convenience and necessities of mankind. A concession thus extorted, in opposition to systems, has more authority than if it had been made in prosecution of them.

What other reason, indeed, could writers ever give why this must be *mine* and that *yours*, since uninstructed nature, surely, never made any such distinction? The objects which receive these appellations are of themselves foreign to us? they are totally disjoined and separated from us, and nothing but the general interests of society can form the connection.

Sometimes the interests of society may require a rule of justice in a particular case, but may not determine any particular rule, among several, which are all equally beneficial. In that case the *slightest* analogies are laid hold of, in order to prevent that indifference and ambiguity, which would be the source of perpetual dissention. Thus, possession alone, and first possession, is supposed to convey property, where nobody else has any preceding claim and pretension. Many of the reasonings of lawyers are of this analogical nature, and depend on very slight connections of the imagination.

Does any one scruple, in extraordinary cases, to violate all regard to the private property of individuals, and sacrifice to public interest a distinction which had been established for the sake of that interest? The safety of the people is the supreme law, all other particular laws are subordinate to it, and dependent on it and if, in the *common* course of things, they be followed and regarded, it is only because the public safety and interest *commonly* demand so equal and impartial administration.

Sometimes both *utility* and *analogy* fail, and leave the laws of justice in total uncertainty. Thus, it is highly requisite, that prescription or long possession should convey property, but what number of days, or months, or years, should be sufficient for that purpose, it is impossible for reason alone to determine. *Civil laws* here supply the place of the natural *code*, and assign different terms for prescription, according to the different *utilities* proposed by the legislator. Bills of exchange and promissory notes, by the laws of most countries, prescribe sooner than bonds, and mortgages, and contracts of a more formal nature.

In general, we may observe, that all questions of property are subordinate to the authority of civil laws, which extend, restrain, modify, and alter the rules of natural justice, according to the particular *convenience* of each community. The laws have, or ought to have, a constant reference to the constitution of government, the manners, the climate, the religion, the commerce, the situation of each society. A late author of genius, as well as learning, has prosecuted this subject at large, and has established, from these principles, a system of

political knowledge, which abounds in ingenious and brilliant thoughts, and is not wanting in solidity.*

What is a man's property? Any thing, which it is lawful for him, and for him alone, to use. *But what rule have we, by which we can distinguish these objects?* Here we must have recourse to statutes, customs, precedents, analogies, and a hundred other circumstances; some of which are constant and inflexible, some variable and arbitrary. But the ultimate point, in which they all professedly terminate, is the interest and happiness of human society. Where this enters not into our consideration, nothing can appear more whimsical, unnatural, and even superstitious, than all or most of the laws of justice and of property.

Those, who ridicule vulgar superstitions, and expose the folly of particular regards to meats, days, places, postures, apparel, have an easy task; while they consider all the qualities and relations of the objects, and discover no adequate cause for that affection or antipathy, veneration or horror, which have so mighty an influence over a considerable part of mankind. A Syrian would have starved rather than taste pigeon; an Egyptian would not have approached bacon: but if these species of food be examined by the senses of sight, smell, or taste, or scrutinized by the sciences of chemistry, medicine, or physics; no difference is ever found between them and any other species, nor can that precise circumstance be pitched on, which may afford a just foundation for the religious passion. A fowl on Thursday is lawful food; on Friday abominable: eggs, in this house, and in this diocese, are permitted during Lent; a hundred paces farther, to eat them is a damnable sin. This earth or building, yesterday was profane; to-day, by the muttering of certain words, it has become holy and sacred.

* The author of *L'Esprit des Loix*. This illustrious writer, however, sets out with a different theory, and supposes all right to be founded on certain *rapports* or relations; which is a system that, in my opinion, never will be reconciled with true philosophy. Malebranche, as far as I can learn, was the first that started this abstract theory of morals, which was afterwards adopted by Cudworth, Clarke, and others; and as it excludes all sentiment, and pretends to found every thing on reason, it has not wanted followers in this philosophic age. [*Sect. I. Appen. I.*] With regard to justice, the virtue here treated of, the inference against this theory seems short and conclusive. Property is allowed to be dependent on civil laws; civil laws are allowed to have no other object but the interest of society: this therefore must be allowed to be the sole foundation of property and justice. Not to mention, that our obligation *itself* to obey the magistrate and his laws is founded in nothing but the interests of society.

If the ideas of justice, sometimes, do not follow the disposition of civil law; we shall find, that these cases, instead of objections, are confirmations of the theory delivered above. Where a civil law is so perverse as to cross all the interests of society, it loses all its authority, and men judge by the ideas of natural justice, which are conformable to those interests. Sometimes also civil laws, for useful purposes, require a ceremony or form to any deed; and where that is wanting, their decrees run contrary to the usual tenor of justice; but one who takes advantage of such chicanes, is not commonly regarded as an honest man. Thus, the interests of society require, that contracts be fulfilled; and there is not a more material article either of natural or civil justice: but the omission of a trifling circumstance will often, by law, invalidate a contract, *in foro humano*, but not *in foro conscientiae*, as divines express themselves. In these cases, the magistrate is supposed only to withdraw his power of enforcing the right, not to have altered the right. Where his intention extends to the right, and is conformable to the interests of society, it never fails to alter the right; a clear proof of the origin of justice and of property, as assigned above.

Such reflections as these, in the mouth of a philosopher, one may safely say, are too obvious to have any influence; because they must always, to every man, occur at first sight; and where they prevail not, of themselves, they are surely obstructed by education, prejudice, and passion, not by ignorance or mistake.

It may appear to a careless view, or rather a too abstracted reflection, that there enters a like superstition into all the sentiments of justice; and that, if a man expose its object, or what we call property, to the same scrutiny of sense and science, he will not, by the most accurate inquiry, find any foundation for the difference made by moral sentiment. I may lawfully nourish myself from this tree; but the fruit of another of the same species, ten paces off, it is criminal for me to touch. Had I worn this apparel an hour ago, I had merited the severest punishment; but a man, by pronouncing a few magical syllables, has now rendered it fit for my use and service. Were this house placed in the neighbouring territory, it had been immoral for me to dwell in it; but being built on this side the river, it is subject to a different municipal law, and, by its becoming mine, I incur no blame or censure. The same species of reasoning, it may be thought, which so successively exposes superstition, is also applicable to justice; nor is it possible, in the one case, more than in the other, to point out, in the object, that precise quality or circumstance, which is the foundation of the sentiment.

But there is this material difference between *superstition* and *justice*, that the former is frivolous, useless, and burdensome; the latter is absolutely requisite to the well being of mankind, and existence of society. When we abstract from this circumstance (for it is too apparent ever to be overlooked) it must be confessed, that all regards to right and property, seems entirely without foundation, as much as the grossest and most vulgar superstition. Were the interests of society nowise concerned, it is as unintelligible why another's articulating certain sounds, implying consent, should change the nature of my actions with regard to a particular object, as why the reciting of a liturgy by a priest, in a certain habit and posture, should dedicate a heap of brick and timber, and render it, thenceforth and for ever, sacred.*

* It is evident, that the will or consent alone never transfers property, nor causes the obligation of a promise (for the same reasoning extends to both,) but the will must be expressed by words or signs, in order to impose a tie upon any man. The expression being once brought in as subservient to the will, soon becomes the principal part of the promise; nor will a man be less bound by his word, though he secretly give a different direction to his intention, and withhold the assent of his mind. But though the expression makes, on most occasions, the whole of the promise, yet it does not always so; and one who should make use of any expression, of which he knows not the meaning, and which he uses without any sense of the consequences, would not certainly be bound by it. Nay, though he know its meaning, yet if he uses it in jest only, and with such signs as evidently show that he has no serious intention of binding himself, he would not lie under any obligation of performance; but it is necessary that the words be a perfect expression of the will, without any contrary signs. Nay, even this we must not carry so far as to imagine, that one whom, by our quickness of understanding,

These reflections are far from weakening the obligations of justice, or diminishing any thing from the most sacred attention to property. On the contrary, such sentiments must acquire new force from the present reasoning For what stronger foundation can be desired or conceived for any duty, than to observe, that human society, or even human nature, could not subsist, without the establishment of it, and will still arrive at greater degrees of happiness and perfection, the more inviolable the regard is, which is paid to that duty?

The dilemma seems obvious as justice evidently tends to promote public utility, and to support civil society, the sentiment of justice is either derived from our reflecting on that tendency, or, like hunger, thirst, and other appetites, resentment, love of life, attachment to offspring, and other passions, arises from a simple original instinct in the human breast, which nature has implanted for like salutary purposes. If the latter be the case, it follows that property, which is the object of justice, is also distinguished by a simple, original instinct, and is not ascertained by any argument or reflection But who is there that ever heard of such an instinct? Or is this a subject, in which new discoveries can be made? We may as well expect to discover, in the body, new senses, which had before escaped the observation of all mankind

But farther, though it seems a very simple proposition to say, that nature, by an instinctive sentiment, distinguishes property, yet in reality we shall find, that there are required for that purpose ten thousand different instincts, and these employed about objects of the greatest intricacy and nicest discernment For when a definition of

standing, we conjecture, from certain signs to have an intention of deceiving us is not bound by his expression or verbal promise, if we accept of it but must limit this conclusion to those cases where the signs are of a different nature from those of deceit. All these contradictions are easily accounted for, if justice arise entirely from its usefulness to society but will never be explained on any other hypothesis

It is remarkable, that the moral decisions of the *Jesuits*, and other relaxed casuists, were commonly formed in prosecution of some such subtilties of reasoning as are here pointed out, and proceeded as much from the habit of scholastic refinement as from any corruption of the heart, if we may follow the authority of Bayle (Article LOYOLA) And why has the indignation of mankind risen so high against these casuists but because every one perceived, that human society could not subsist were such practices authorised and that morals must always be handled with a view to public interest more than philosophical regularity? If the secret *direction of the intention*, said every man of sense, could invalidate a contract where is our security? And yet a metaphysical schoolman might think, that where an intention was supposed to be requisite, if that intention really had no place no consequence ought to follow, and no obligation be imposed. The casuistical subtilties may not be greater than the subtilties of lawyers, hinted at above but as the former are *pernicious*, and the latter *innocent* and *even necessary* this is the reason of the very different reception they meet with from the world.

It is a doctrine of the church of Rome, that the priest, by a secret direction of his intention, can invalidate any sacrament. This position is derived from a strict and regular prosecution of the obvious truth, that empty words alone, without any meaning or intention in the speaker, can never be attended with any effect If the same conclusion be not admitted in reasonings concerning civil contracts, where the affair is allowed to be of so much less consequence than the eternal salvation of thousands, it proceeds entirely from men's sense of the danger and inconvenience of the doctrine in the former case and we may thence observe, that however positive, arrogant, and dogmatical, any superstition may appear, it never can convey any thorough persuasion of the reality of its objects, or put them, in any degree, on a balance with the common incidents of life, which we learn from daily observation and experimental reasoning.

property is required, that relation is found to resolve itself into any possession acquired by occupation, by industry, by prescription, by inheritance, by contract, &c. Can we think that nature, by an original instinct, instructs us in all these methods of acquisition?

These words, too, inheritance and contract, stand for ideas infinitely complicated, and to define them exactly, a hundred volumes of laws, and a thousand volumes of commentators, have not been found sufficient Does nature, whose instincts in men are all simple, embrace such complicated and artificial objects, and create a rational creature, without trusting any thing to the operation of his reason?

But even though all this were admitted, it would not be satisfactory Positive laws can certainly transfer property Is it by another original instinct that we recognise the authority of kings and senates, and mark all the boundaries of their jurisdiction? Judges, too, even though their sentence be erroneous and illegal, must be allowed, for the sake of peace, and order, to have decisive authority, and ultimately to determine property Have we original, innate ideas, of praetors, and chancellors, and juries? Who sees not, that all these institutions arise merely from the necessities of human society?

All birds of the same species, in every age and country, build their nests alike in this we see the force of instinct. Men, in different times and places, frame their houses differently here we perceive the influence of reason and custom. A like inference may be drawn from comparing the instinct of generation and the institution of property

How great soever the variety of municipal laws, it must be confessed, that their chief outlines pretty regularly concur, because the purposes to which they tend are everywhere exactly similar In like manner, all houses have a roof and walls, windows and chimneys; though diversified in their shape, figure, and materials The purposes of the latter, directed to the conveniences of human life, discover not more plainly their origin from reason and reflection, than do those of the former, which point all to a like end.

I need not mention the variations, which all the rules of property receive from the finer turns and connections of the imagination, and from the subtleties and abstractions of law-topics and reasonings. There is no possibility of reconciling this observation to the notion of original instinct

What alone will beget a doubt concerning the theory, on which I insist, is the influence of education and acquired habits, by which we are so accustomed to blame injustice, that we are not, in every instance, conscious of any immediate reflection on the pernicious consequences of it. The views the most familiar to us are apt, for that very reason, to escape us, and what we have very frequently performed from certain motives, we are apt likewise to continue mechanically, without recalling, on every occasion, the reflections which first deter-

mined us. The convenience, or rather necessity, which leads to justice, is so universal, and every where points so much to the same rules, that the habit takes place in all societies, and it is not without some scrutiny, that we are able to ascertain its true origin The matter, however, is not so obscure, but that, even in common life, we have, every moment, recourse to the principle of public utility, and ask, *What must become of the world, if such practices prevail? How could society subsist under such disorders?* Were the distinction or separation of possessions entirely useless, can any one conceive that it ever should have obtained in society?

Thus we seem, upon the whole, to have attained a knowledge of the force of that principle here insisted on, and can determine what degree of esteem or moral approbation may result from reflections on public interest and utility. The necessity of justice to the support of society is the SOLE foundation of that virtue, and since no moral excellence is more highly esteemed, we may conclude, that this circumstance of usefulness has, in general, the strongest energy, and most entire command over our sentiments It must, therefore, be the source of a considerable part of the merit ascribed to humanity, benevolence, friendship, public spirit, and other social virtues of that stamp, as it is the SOLE source of the moral approbation paid to fidelity, justice, veracity, integrity, and those other estimable and useful qualities and principles It is entirely agreeable to the rules of philosophy, and even of common reason, where any principle has been found to have a great force and energy in one instance, to ascribe to it a like energy in all similar instances This indeed is Newton's chief rule of philosophising [Principia, lib iii]

SECTION IV.—OF POLITICAL SOCIETY.

HAD every man sufficient *sagacity* to perceive, at all times, the strong interest, which binds him to the observance of justice and equity, and *strength of mind* sufficient to persevere in a steady adherence to a general and distant interest, in opposition to the allurements of present pleasure and advantage, there had never, in that case, been any such thing as government or political society, but each man, following his natural liberty, had lived in entire peace and harmony with all others. What need of positive law, where natural justice is, of itself, a sufficient restraint? Why create magistrates, where there never arise any disorder or iniquity? Why abridge our native freedom, when, in every instance, the utmost exertion of it is found innocent and beneficial? It is evident, that, if government were totally useless,

it never could have place, and that the SOLE foundation of the duty of ALLEGIANCE is the *advantage* which it procures to society, by preserving peace and order among mankind

When a number of political societies are erected, and maintain a great intercourse together, a new set of rules are immediately discovered to be *useful* in that particular situation, and accordingly take place under the title of LAWS of NATIONS Of this kind are, the sacredness of the persons of ambassadors, abstaining from poisoned arms, quarter in war, with others of that kind, which are plainly calculated for the *advantage* of states and kingdoms, in their intercourse with each other

The rules of justice, such as prevail among individuals, are not entirely suspended among political societies All princes pretend a regard to the rights of other princes, and some, no doubt, without hypocrisy Alliances and treaties are every day made between independent states, which would only be so much waste of parchment, if they were not found, by experience, to have some influence and authority But here is the difference between kingdoms and individuals Human nature cannot, by any means, subsist without the association of individuals, and that association never could have place, were no regard paid to the laws of equity and justice Disorder, confusion, the war of all against all, are the necessary consequences of such a licentious conduct But nations can subsist without intercourse. they may even subsist, in some degree, under a general war. The observance of justice, though useful among them, is not guarded by so strong a necessity as among individuals, and the *moral obligation* holds proportion with the *usefulness* All politicians will allow, and most philosophers, that REASONS of STATE may, in particular emergencies, dispense with the rules of justice, and invalidate any treaty or alliance, where the strict observance of it would be prejudicial, in a considerable degree, to either of the contracting parties. But nothing less than the most extreme necessity, it is confessed, can justify individuals in a breach of promise, or an invasion of the properties of others

In a confederated commonwealth, such as the Achæan republic of old, or the Swiss Cantons and United Provinces in modern times, as the league has here a peculiar *utility*, the conditions of union have a peculiar sacredness and authority, and a violation of them would be regarded as no less, or even as more criminal, than any private injury or injustice.

The long and helpless infancy of man requires the combination of parents for the subsistence of their young; and that combination requires the virtue of CHASTITY or fidelity to the marriage bed.

An infidelity of this nature is much more *pernicious* [illegible]

in men. Hence the laws of chastity are much stricter over the one sex than over the other.

These rules have all a reference to generation, and yet women past child-bearing are no more supposed to be exempted from them than those in the flower of their youth and beauty. *General rules* are often extended beyond the principle whence they first arise, and this in all matters of taste and sentiment. It is a vulgar story at Paris, that, during the rage of the MISSISSIPI, a hump-backed fellow went every day into the RUE DE QUINCEMPOIX, where the stock-jobbers met in great crowds, and was well paid for allowing them to make use of his hump as a desk, in order to sign their contracts upon it. Would the fortune, which he raised by this expedient, make him a handsome fellow, though it be confessed that personal beauty arises very much from ideas of utility? The imagination is influenced by associations of ideas, which, though they arise at first from the judgment, are not easily altered by every particular exception that occurs to us. To which we may add, in the present case of chastity, that the example of the old would be pernicious to the young, and that women, continually foreseeing that a certain time would bring them the liberty of indulgence, would naturally advance that period, and think more lightly of this whole duty, so requisite to society.

Those who live in the same family have such frequent opportunities of licence of this kind, that nothing could preserve purity of manners, were marriage allowed among the nearest relations, or any intercourse of love between them ratified by law and custom. INCEST, therefore, being *pernicious* in a superior degree, has also a superior turpitude and moral deformity annexed to it.

What is the reason why, by the Athenian laws, one might marry a half-sister by the father, but not by the mother? Plainly this: the manners of the Athenians were so reserved, that a man was never permitted to approach the women's apartment, even in the same family, unless where he visited his own mother. His step-mother and her children were as much shut up from him as the women of any other family, and there was as little danger of any criminal correspondence between them. Uncles and nieces, for a like reason, might marry at Athens; but neither these, nor half-brothers and sisters, could contract that alliance at Rome, where the intercourse was more open between the sexes. Public utility is the cause of all these variations.

To repeat, to a man's prejudice, any thing that escaped him in private conversation, or to make any such use of his private letters, is highly blamed. The free and social intercourse of minds must be extremely checked, where no such rules of fidelity are established.

Even in repeating stories, whence we can foresee no ill consequences to result, the giving of one's author is regarded as a piece of indiscretion, if not of immorality. These stories, in passing from hand to

hand, and receiving all the usual variations, frequently come about to the persons concerned, and produce animosities and quarrels among people, whose intentions are the most innocent and inoffensive.

To pry into secrets, to open or even read the letters of others, to play the spy upon their words, and looks, and actions, what habits more inconvenient in society? What habits, of consequence, more blameable?

This principle is also the foundation of most of the laws of good manners, a kind of lesser morality, calculated for the ease of company and conversation. Too much or too little ceremony are both blamed, and every thing, which promotes ease, without an indecent familiarity, is useful and laudable.

Constancy in friendships, attachments, and familiarities, is commendable, and is requisite to support trust and good correspondence in society. But in places of general, though casual concourse, where the pursuit of health and pleasure brings people promiscuously together, public conveniency has dispensed with this maxim, and custom there promotes an unreserved conversation for the time, by indulging the privilege of dropping afterwards every indifferent acquaintance, without breach of civility or good manners.

Even in societies, which are established on principles the most immoral, and the most destructive to the interests of the general society, there are required certain rules, which a species of false honour, as well as private interest, engages the members to observe. Robbers and pirates, it has often been remarked, could not maintain their pernicious confederacy, did they not establish a new distributive justice, among themselves, and recall those laws of equity, which they have violated with the rest of mankind.

I hate a drinking companion, says the Greek proverb, who never forgets. The follies of the last debauch should be buried in eternal oblivion, in order to give full scope to the follies of the next.

Among nations, where an immoral gallantry, if covered with a thin veil of mystery, is, in some degree, authorised by custom, there immediately arise a set of rules, calculated for the conveniency of that attachment. The famous court or parliament of love in PROVENCE formerly decided all difficult cases of this nature.

In societies for play, there are laws required for the conduct of the game, and these laws are different in each game. The foundation, I own, of such societies, is frivolous, and the laws are, in a great measure, though not altogether, capricious and arbitrary. So far is there a material difference between them and the rules of justice, fidelity, and loyalty. The general societies of men are absolutely requisite for the subsistence of the species, and the public conveniency, which regulates morals, is inviolably established in the nature of man, and of the world in which he lives. The comparison,

therefore in these respects, is very imperfect. We may only learn from it the necessity of rules, wherever men have any intercourse with each other

They cannot even pass each other on the road without rules. Waggoners, coachmen, and postilions have principles, by which they give the way, and these are chiefly founded on mutual ease and convenience. Sometimes also they are arbitrary, at least dependent on a kind of capricious analogy, like many of the reasonings of lawyers.*

To carry the matter farther, we may observe, that it is impossible for men so much as to murder each other without statutes, and maxims, and an idea of justice and honour War has its laws as well as peace, and even that sportive kind of war, carried on among wrestlers, boxers, cudgel-players, gladiators, is regulated by fixed principles. Common interest and utility beget infallibly a standard of right and wrong among the parties concerned.

SECTION V —WHY UTILITY PLEASES.

PART I —It seems so natural a thought to ascribe to their utility the praise which we bestow on the social virtues, that one would expect to meet with this principle every where in moral writers, as the chief foundation of their reasoning and inquiry In common life we may observe, that the circumstance of utility is always appealed to nor is it supposed, that a greater eulogy can be given to any man, than to display his usefulness to the public, and enumerate his services, which he has performed to mankind and society What praise, even of an inanimate form, if the regularity and elegance of its parts destroy not its fitness for any useful purpose! And how satisfactory an apology for any disproportion or seeming deformity, if we can show the necessity of that particular construction for the use intended! A ship appears more beautiful to an artist, or one moderately skilled in navigation, where its prow is wide and swelling beyond its poop, than if it were framed with the precise geometrical regularity, in contradiction to all the laws of mechanics A building, whose doors and windows were exact squares, would hurt the eye by that very proportion, as ill adapted to the figure of a human creature, for whose service the fabric was intended, What wonder then that a man, whose habits and conduct are hurtful to society, and dangerous and pernicious to every one

* That the lighter machine yields to the heavier, and, in machines of the same kind, that the empty yields to the loaded, this rule is founded on convenience That those who are going to the capital take place of those who are coming from it, this seems to be founded on some idea of the dignity of the great city, and of the preference of the future to the past. From like reasons, among foot-walkers, the right-hand entitles a man to the wall, and prevents jostling, which peaceable people find very disagreeable and inconvenient.

who has an intercourse with him, should, on that account, be an object of disapprobation, and communicate to every spectator the strongest sentiment of disgust and hatred.*

But perhaps the difficulty of accounting for these effects of usefulness, or its contrary, has kept philosophers from admitting them into their systems of ethics, and has induced them rather to employ any other principle, in explaining the origin of moral good and evil. But it is no just reason for rejecting any principle, confirmed by experience, that we cannot give a satisfactory account of its origin, nor are able to resolve it into other more general principles. And if we would employ a little thought on the present subject, we need be at no loss to account for the influence of utility, and to deduce it from principles the most known and avowed in human nature.

From the apparent usefulness of the social virtues, it has readily been inferred by sceptics, both ancient and modern, that all moral distinctions arise from education, and were, at first, invented, and afterwards encouraged, by the art of politicians, in order to render men tractable, and subdue their natural ferocity and selfishness, which incapacitated them for society. This principle, indeed, of precept and education, must so far be owned to have a powerful influence, that it may frequently increase or diminish, beyond their natural standard, the sentiments of approbation or dislike; and may even, in particular instances, create, without any natural principle, a new sentiment of this kind, as it is evident in all superstitious practices and observances: but that *all* moral affection or dislike arises from this origin, will never surely be allowed by any judicious inquirer. Had nature made no such distinction, founded on the original constitution of the mind, the words *honourable* and *shameful*, *lovely*, and *odious*, *noble* and *despicable*, had never had place in any language

I hate a drinki ... ticians, had they invented these terms, ever have been
forgets. The follies ... them intelligible, or make them convey any idea to the
oblivion, in order to give ... it nothing can be more superficial than this paradox
nor could ... where ... it were well, if, in the abstruser studies of logic
able to render t... pol... some ... rule
audience. So tha... ous
of the sceptics, and

* We ought not to imagine, ... because an inanimate object may be useful as well as a man, ... according to this system, to merit the appellation of ... ity, are in the two cases, very different; and the one is ... tion, &c. and not the other. In like manner, an inanimate ... proportions as well as a human figure. But can we ever be ... are a numerous set of passions and sentiments, of which, ... the original constitution of nature, the only proper objects ... ies be transferred to an insensible, inanimate being, they will ... The beneficial qualities of herbs and minerals are, indeed, ... but this is an effect of the caprice of language, which ought not ... though there be a species of approbation attending even ... yet this sentiment is so weak, and so different from that ... magistrates or statesmen, that they ought not to be ranked ... object, even where the same qualities are ... same beauty, transferred to a different ... extremely perverted.

that therefore it ought also ... The sentiments, excited by util... with affection, esteem, approba... object may have good colour an... in love with the former? There... thinking, rational beings are, by ... and though the very same qualit... not excite the same sentiments. ... sometimes called their virtue ... to be regarded in reasoning. For ... inanimate objects, when benefic... which is directed to bene... under the same cla... A very ...

and metaphysics, we could as easily obviate the cavils of that sort, as in the practical and more intelligible sciences of politics and morals.

The social virtues must, therefore, be allowed to have a natural beauty and amiableness, which, at first, antecedent to all precept or education, recommends them to the esteem of uninstructed mankind, and engages their affections. And as the public utility of these virtues is the chief circumstance, whence they derive their merit, it follows, that the end, which they have a tendency to promote, must be in some way agreeable to us, and take hold of some natural affection. It must please, either from considerations of self-interest, or from more generous motives and regards

It has often been asserted, that as every man has a strong connection with society, and perceives the impossibility of his solitary subsistence, he becomes, on that account, favourable to all those habits or principles, which promote order in society, and insure to him the quiet possession of so inestimable a blessing As much as we value our own happiness and welfare, as much must we applaud the practice of justice and humanity, by which alone the social confederacy can be maintained, and every man reap the fruits of mutual protection and assistance.

This deduction of morals from self-love, or a regard to private interest, is an obvious thought, and has not arisen wholly from the wanton sallies and sportive assaults of the sceptics To mention no others, Polybius, one of the gravest and most judicious, as well as most moral writers of antiquity, has assigned the selfish origin to all our sentiments of virtue.* But though the solid practical sense of that author, and his aversion to all subtilties, render his authority on the present subject very considerable, yet is not this an affair to be decided by authority, and the voice of nature and experience seems plainly to oppose the selfish theory

We frequently bestow praise on virtuous actions, performed in very distant ages and remote countries, where the utmost subtilty of imagination would not discover any appearance of self-interest, or find any connection of our present happiness and security with events so widely separated from us.

A generous, a brave, a noble deed, performed by an adversary, com-

* Undutifulness to parents is disapproved of by mankind προορωμενους το μελλον, και συλλογιζομενους οτι το παραπλησιον εκαστοις αυτων συγκυρησει. Ingratitude, for a like reason (though he seems there to mix a more generous regard) συναγανακτουντας μεν τω πελας, αναφεροντας δ' επ' αυτους το παραπλησιον εξ ων υπογιγνεται τις εννοια [illegible] του καθηκοντος δυναμεως και θεωριας Lib. vi. cap. 4. Perhaps the historian only meant, that our sympathy and humanity were more enlivened, by our considering the similarity of our case with that of the person suffering, which is a just sentiment.

mands our approbation; while in its consequences it may be acknowledged prejudicial to our particular interest.

Where private advantage concurs, with general affection for virtue, we readily perceive and avow the mixture of these distinct sentiments, which have a very different feeling and influence on the mind. We praise, perhaps, with more alacrity, where the generous, humane action, contributes to our particular interest but the topics of praise, which we insist on, are very wide of this circumstance And we may attempt to bring over others to our sentiments, without endeavouring to convince them that they reap any advantage from the actions which we recommend to their approbation and applause

Frame the model of a praiseworthy character, consisting of all the most amiable moral virtues give instances in which these display themselves after an eminent and extraordinary manner: you readily engage the esteem and approbation of all your audience, who never so much as inquire in what age and country the person lived who possessed these noble qualities a circumstance, however, of all others, the most material to self-love, or a concern for our own individual happiness

Once on a time, a statesman, in the shock and contest of parties, prevailed so far as to procure, by his eloquence, the banishment of an able adversary, whom he secretly followed, offering him money for his support during his exile, and soothing him with topics of consolation in his misfortunes *Alas!* cries the banished statesman, *with what regret must I leave my friends in this city, where even enemies are so generous!* Virtue, though in an enemy, here pleased him and we also give it the just tribute of praise and approbation, nor, do we retract these sentiments, when we hear that the action passed at Athens about two thousand years ago, and that the persons names were Eschines and Demosthenes

What is that to me? There are few occasions when this question is not pertinent and had it that universal, infallible influence supposed, it would turn into ridicule every composition, and almost every conversation, which contains any praise or censure of men and manners

It is but a weak subterfuge, when pressed by these facts and arguments, to say that we transport ourselves, by the force of imagination, into distant ages and countries, and consider the advantage which we should have reaped from these characters had we been contemporaries, and had any commerce with the persons. It is not conceivable, how a *real* sentiment or passion can ever arise from a known *imaginary* interest, especially when our *real* interest is still kept in view, and is often acknowledged to be entirely distinct from the imaginary, and even sometimes opposite to it.

A man, brought to the brink of a precipice, cannot look down with

out trembling; and the sentiment of *imaginary* danger actuates him, in opposition to the opinion and belief of *real* safety But the imagination is here assisted by the presence of a striking object, and yet prevails not, except it be also aided by novelty, and the unusual appearance of the object Custom soon reconciles us to heights and precipices, and wears off these false and delusive terrors The reverse is observable in the estimates which we form of characters and manners: and the more we habituate ourselves to an accurate scrutiny of morals, the more delicate feeling do we acquire of the most minute distinctions between vice and virtue Such frequent occasion, indeed, have we, in common life, to pronounce all kinds of moral determinations, that no object of this kind can be new or unusual to us, nor could any *false* views or prepossessions maintain their ground against an experience so common and familiar Experience being chiefly what forms the associations of ideas, it is impossible that any association could establish and support itself in direct opposition to that principle

Usefulness is agreeable, and engages our approbation This is a matter of fact, confirmed by daily observation But *useful*! For what? For some body's interest, surely Whose interest, then? Not our own, only for our approbation frequently extends farther It must, therefore, be the interest of those who are served by the character or action approved of, and these, we may conclude, however remote, are not totally indifferent to us By opening up this principle, we shall discover one great source of moral distinctions.

PART II —SELF-LOVE is a principle in human nature of such extensive energy, and the interest of each individual is in general so closely connected with that of the community, that those philosophers were excusable, who fancied that all our concern for the public might be resolved into a concern for our own happiness and preservation. They saw, every moment, instances of approbation or blame, satisfaction or displeasure, towards characters and actions they denominated the objects of these sentiments, *virtues* or *vices*, they observed, that the former had a tendency to increase the happiness, and the latter the misery of mankind, they asked, whether it were possible that we could have any general concern for society, or any disinterested resentment of the welfare or injury of others, they found it simpler to consider all these sentiments as modifications of self-love, and they discovered a pretence, at least, for this unity of principle, in that close union of interest which is so observable between the public and each individual.

But notwithstanding this frequent confusion of interests, it is easy to attain what natural philosophers, after Bacon, have affected to call the *experimentum crucis*, or that experiment which points out the

right way in any doubt or ambiguity We have found instances, in which private interest was separate from public, in which it was even contrary, and yet we observed the moral sentiment to continue, notwithstanding this disjunction of interests. And wherever these distinct interests sensibly concurred, we always found a sensible increase of the sentiment, and a more warm affection to virtue, and detestation of vice, or what we properly call *gratitude* and *revenge* Compelled by these instances, we must renounce the theory which accounts for every moral sentiment by the principle of self-love. We must adopt a more public affection, and allow that the interests of society are not, even on their own account, entirely indifferent to us. Usefulness is only a tendency to a certain end, and it is a contradiction in terms, that any thing pleases as means to an end, where the end itself nowise affects us If usefulness, therefore, be a source of moral sentiment, and if this usefulness be not always considered with a reference to self, it follows, that every thing which contributes to the happiness of society recommends itself directly to our approbation and good-will Here is a principle, which accounts, in great part, for the origin of morality and what need we seek for abstruse and remote systems, when there occurs one so obvious and natural? *

Have we any difficulty in comprehending the force of humanity and benevolence? Or to conceive, that the very aspect of happiness, joy, prosperity, gives pleasure, that of pain, suffering, sorrow, communicates uneasiness? The human countenance says Horace,† borrows smiles or tears from the human countenance Reduce a person to solitude, and he loses all enjoyment, except either of the sensual or speculative kind, and that because the movements of his heart are not forwarded by correspondent movements in his fellow creatures. The signs of sorrow and mourning, though arbitrary, affect us with melancholy, but the natural symptoms, tears, and cries, and groans, never fail to infuse compassion and uneasiness And if the effects of misery touch us in so lively a manner, can we be supposed altogether insensible or indifferent towards its causes, when a malicious or treacherous character and behaviour are presented to us?

We enter, I shall suppose, into a convenient, warm, well-contrived apartment we necessarily receive a pleasure from its very survey; because it presents us with the pleasing ideas of ease, satisfaction, and

* It is needless to push our researches so far as to ask, why we have humanity or a fellow-feeling with others? It is sufficient that this is experienced to be a principle in human nature. We must stop somewhere in our examination of causes and there are, in every [illegible] some general principles, beyond which we cannot hope to find any principle [illegible] No man is absolutely indifferent to the happiness and misery of others. [illegible] a natural tendency to give pleasure the second, pain. This every one may [illegible] It is not probable that these principles can be resolved into principles [illegible] universal, whatever attempts may have been made to that purpose. But if [illegible] it belongs not to the present subject, and we may here [illegible] original; happy, if we can render all the consequences sufficiently plain [illegible]

† Uti ridentibus arrident, ita flentibus adflent Humani vultus.—Hor.

enjoyment. The hospitable, good-humoured, humane landlord appears. This circumstance surely must embellish the whole, nor can we easily forbear reflecting, with pleasure, on the satisfaction which results to every one from his intercourse and good offices

His whole family, by the freedom, ease, confidence, and calm enjoyment, diffused over their countenances, sufficiently express their happiness. I have a pleasing sympathy in the prospect of so much joy, and can never consider the source of it without the most agreeable emotions

He tells me that an oppressive and powerful neighbour had attempted to dispossess him of his inheritance, and had long disturbed all his innocent and social pleasures I feel an immediate indignation arise in me against such violence and injury

But it is no wonder, he adds, that a private wrong should proceed from a man who had enslaved provinces, depopulated cities, and made the field and scaffold stream with human blood. I am struck with horror at the prospect of so much misery, and am actuated by the strongest antipathy against its author

In general, it is certain, that, wherever we go, whatever we reflect on or converse about, every thing still presents us with the view of human happiness or misery, and excites in our breast a sympathetic movement of pleasure or uneasiness In our serious occupations, in our careless amusements, this principle still exerts its active energy

A man who enters the theatre is immediately struck with the view of so great a multitude, participating of one common amusement, and experiences, from their very aspect, a superior sensibility or disposition of being affected with every sentiment which he shares with his fellow-creatures

He observes the actors to be animated by the appearance of a full audience, and raised to a degree of enthusiasm which they cannot command in any solitary or calm moment

Every movement of the theatre, by a skilful poet, is communicated, as it were, by magic to the spectators, who weep, tremble, resent, rejoice, and are inflamed with all the variety of passions which actuate the several personages of the drama

Where any event crosses our wishes, and interrupts the happiness of the favourite characters, we feel a sensible anxiety and concern. But where their sufferings proceed from the treachery, cruelty, or tyranny of an enemy, our breasts are affected with the liveliest resentment against the author of these calamities

It is here esteemed contrary to the rules of art to represent any thing cool and indifferent. A distant friend, or a confidant, who has no immediate interest in the catastrophe, ought, if possible, to be avoided by the poet: as communicating a like indifference to the audience, and checking the progress of the passions

Few species of poetry are more entertaining than *pastoral;* and every one is sensible, that the chief source of its pleasure arises from those images of a gentle or tender tranquillity which it represents in its personages, and of which it communicates a like sentiment to the reader Sannazarius, who transferred the scene to the sea-shore, though he presented the most magnificent object in nature, is confessed to have erred in his choice The idea of toil, labour, and danger, suffered by the fishermen, is painful, by an unavoidable sympathy which attends every conception of human happiness or misery

When I was twenty, says a French poet, Ovid was my favourite now I am forty, I declare for Horace We enter, to be sure, more readily into sentiments which resemble those we feel every day: but no passion, when well represented, can be entirely indifferent to us, because there is none, of which every man has not within him, at least the seeds and first principles It is the business of poetry to bring every affection near to us by lively imagery and representation, and make it look like truth and reality a certain proof, that, wherever that reality is found, our minds are disposed to be strongly affected by it.

Any recent event or piece of news, by which the fate of states, provinces, or many individuals is affected, is extremely interesting even to those whose welfare is not immediately engaged Such intelligence is propagated with celerity, heard with avidity, and inquired into with attention and concern The interest of society appears, on this occasion, to be, in some degree, the interest of each individual The imagination is sure to be affected, though the passions excited may not always be so strong and steady as to have great influence on the conduct and behaviour

The perusal of a history seems a calm entertainment, but would be no entertainment at all, did not our hearts beat with correspondent movements to those which are described by the historian.

Thucydides and Guicciardin support with difficulty our attention; while the former describes the trivial rencounters of the small cities of Greece, and the latter the harmless wars of Pisa The few persons interested, and the small interest, fill not the imagination, and engage not the affections The deep distress of the numerous Athenian army before Syracuse, the danger, which so nearly threatens Venice, these excite compassion, these move terror and anxiety

The indifferent, uninteresting style of Suetonius, equally with the masterly pencil of Tacitus, may convince us of the cruel depravity of Nero or Tiberius, but what a difference of sentiment! While the former coldly relates the facts, and the latter sets before our eyes the venerable figures of a Soranus and a Thrasea, intrepid in their fate, and only moved by the melting sorrows of their friends and kindred. What

sympathy then touches every human heart! What indignation against the tyrant, whose causeless fear or unprovoked malice gave rise to such detestable barbarity!

If we bring these subjects nearer; if we remove all suspicion of fiction and deceit; what powerful concern is excited, and how much superior, in many instances, to the narrow attachments of self-love and private interest! Popular sedition, party zeal, a devoted obedience to factious leaders; these are some of the most visible, though less laudable effects of this social sympathy in human nature.

The frivolousness of the subject, too, we may observe, is not able to detach us entirely from what carries an image of human sentiment and affection.

When a person stutters, and pronounces with difficulty, we even sympathize with this trivial uneasiness, and suffer for him. And it is a rule in criticism, that every combination of syllables or letters, which gives pain to the organs of speech in the recital, appears also, from a species of sympathy, harsh and disagreeable to the ear. Nay, when we run over a book with our eye, we are sensible of such unharmonious composition; because we still imagine, that a person recites it to us, and suffers from the pronunciation of these jarring sounds. So delicate is our sympathy!

Easy and unconstrained postures and motions are always beautiful: an air of health and vigour is agreeable: clothes which warm, without burthening the body; which cover, without imprisoning the limbs, are well-fashioned. In every judgment of beauty, the feelings of the person affected enter into consideration, and communicate to the spectator similar touches of pain or pleasure.* What wonder, then, if we can pronounce no judgment concerning the character and conduct of men, without considering the tendencies of their actions, and the happiness or misery which thence arises to society? what association of ideas would ever operate, were that principle here totally inactive?†

If any man, from a cold insensibility, or narrow selfishness of temper,

* 'Decentior equus cujus astricta sunt ilia; sed idem velocior. Pulcher aspectu sit athleta, cujus lacertos exercitatio expressit; idem certamini paratior. Nunquam enim *species* ab *utilitate* dividitur. Sed hoc quidem discernere modici judicii est.—*Quintilian Inst. lib. viii. cap. 3.*

† In proportion to the station which a man possesses, according to the relations in which he is placed, we always expect from him a greater or less degree of good; and, when disappointed, blame his inutility; and much more do we blame him, if any ill or prejudice arises from his conduct and behaviour. When the interests of one country interfere with those of another, we estimate the merits of a statesman by the good or ill which results to his own country from his measures and counsels, without regard to the prejudice which he brings on its enemies and rivals. His fellow-citizens are the objects which lie nearest the eye while we determine his character. And as nature has implanted in every one a superior affection to his own country, we never expect any regard to distant nations where a competition arises. Not to mention, that while every man consults the good of his own community, we are sensible that the general interest of mankind is better promoted, than by any loose indeterminate views to the good of a species, whence no beneficial action could ever result, for want of a duly limited object on which they could exert themselves.

is unaffected with the images of human happiness or misery, he must be equally indifferent to the images of vice and virtue: as, on the other hand, it is always found, that a warm concern for the interests of our species is attended with a delicate feeling of all moral distinctions; a strong resentment of injury done to men; a lively approbation of their welfare. In this particular, though great superiority is observable of one man above another; yet none are so entirely indifferent to the interests of their fellow-creatures, as to perceive no distinctions of moral good and evil, in consequence of the different tendencies of actions and principles. How, indeed, can we suppose it possible in any one, who wears a human heart, that if there be subjected to his censure, one character or system of conduct, which is beneficial, and another, which is pernicious, to his species or community, he will not so much as give a cool preference to the former, or ascribe it to the smallest merit or regard? Let us suppose such a person ever so selfish; let private interest have ingrossed ever so much his attention; yet in instances, where that is not concerned, he must unavoidably feel *some* propensity to the good of mankind, and make it an object of choice, if every thing else be equal. Would any man, who is walking along, tread as willingly on another's gouty toes, whom he has no quarrel with, as on the hard flint and pavement? There is here surely a difference in the case. We surely take into consideration the happiness and misery of others, in weighing the several motives of action, and incline to the former, where no private regards draw us to seek our own promotion or advantage by the injury of our fellow-creatures. And if the principles of humanity are capable, in many instances, of influencing our actions, they must, at all times, have *some* authority over our sentiments, and give us a general approbation of what is useful to society, and blame of what is dangerous or pernicious. The degrees of these sentiments may be the subject of controversy; but the reality of their existence, one should think, must be admitted, in every theory or system.

A creature, absolutely malicious, and spiteful, were there any such in nature, must be worse than indifferent to the images of vice and virtue. All his sentiments must be inverted, and directly opposite to those which prevail in the human species. Whatever contributes to the good of mankind, as it crosses the constant bent of his wishes and desires, must produce uneasiness and disapprobation; and, on the contrary, whatever is the source of disorder and misery in society, must, for the same reason, be regarded with pleasure and complacency. Timon, who probably from his affected spleen, more than any inveterate malice, was denominated the man-hater, embraced Alcibiades with great fondness. *Go on, my boy!* cried he, *acquire the confidence of the people: you will one day, I foresee, be the cause of great calamities to them.* [Plutarch in vita Alc.] Could we admit the

two principles of the Manicheans, it is an infallible consequence, that their sentiments of human actions, as well as of every thing else, must be totally opposite, and that every instance of justice and humanity, from its necessary tendency, must please the one deity and displease the other. All mankind so far resemble the good principle, that, where interest, or revenge, or envy, prevents not our disposition, we are always inclined, from our natural philanthropy, to give the preference to the happiness of society, and consequently to virtue above its opposite. Absolute, unprovoked, disinterested malice, has never, perhaps, place in any human breast; or if it had, must there pervert all the sentiments of morals, as well as the feelings of humanity. If the cruelty of Nero be allowed to be entirely voluntary, and not rather the effect of constant fear and resentment; it is evident, that Tigellinus, preferably to Seneca or Burrhus, must have possessed his steady and uniform approbation.

A statesman or patriot, who serves our own country, in our own time, has always a more passionate regard paid to him, than one whose beneficial influence operated on distant ages or remote nations; where the good, resulting from his generous humanity, being less connected with us, seems more obscure, and effects us with a less lively sympathy. We may own the merit to be equally great, though our sentiments are not raised to an equal height, in both cases. The judgment here corrects the inequalities of our internal emotions and perceptions; in like manner, as it preserves us from error, in the several variations of images, presented to our external senses. The same object, at a double distance, really throws on the eye a picture of but half the bulk; yet we imagine that it appears of the same size in both situations; because we know, that, on our approach to it, its image would expand on the eye, and that the difference consists not in the object itself but in our position with regard to it. And, indeed, without such a correction of appearances, both in internal and external sentiment, men could never think or talk steadily on any subject; while their fluctuating situations produce a continual variation on objects, and throw them into such different and contrary lights and positions.*

The more we converse with mankind, and the greater social intercourse we maintain, the more shall we be familiarized to these general

* For a like reason, the tendencies of actions and characters, not their real accidental consequences, are alone regarded in our moral determinations or general judgments; though in our real feeling or sentiment we cannot help paying greater regard to one whose station, joined to virtue, renders him really useful to society, than to one who exerts the social virtues only in good intentions and benevolent affections. Separating the character from the fortune, by an easy and necessary effort of thought, we pronounce these persons alike, and give them the same general praise. The judgment corrects, or endeavours to correct, the appearance, but is not able entirely to prevail over sentiment.

Why is this peach-tree said to be better than that other, but because it produces more or better fruit? And would not the same praise be given it, though snails or vermin had destroyed the peaches before they came to full maturity? In morals too, is not the tree known by *the fruit*? And cannot we easily distinguish between nature and accident, in the one case as well as in the other?

preference and distinctions, without which our conversation and discourse could scarcely be rendered intelligible to each other. Every man's interest is peculiar to himself, and the aversions and desires which result from it cannot be supposed to affect others in a like degree General language, therefore, being formed for general use, must be moulded on some more general views, and must affix the epithets of praise or blame, in conformity to sentiments which arise from the general interests of the community And if these sentiments, in most men, be not so strong as those which have a reference to private good, yet still they must make some distinction, even in persons the most depraved and selfish, and must attach the notion of good to a beneficent conduct, and of evil to the contrary Sympathy, we shall allow, is much fainter than our concern for ourselves, and sympathy with persons remote from us, much fainter than that with persons near and contiguous, but for this very reason, it is necessary for us, in our calm judgments and discourse concerning the characters of men, to neglect all these differences, and render our sentiments more public and social Besides, that we ourselves often change our situation in this particular, we every day meet with persons who are in a situation different from us, and who could never converse with us, were we to remain constantly in that position and point of view which is peculiar to ourselves The intercourse of sentiments, therefore, in society and conversation, makes us form some general unalterable standard, by which we may approve or disapprove of characters and manners. And though the heart takes not part entirely with those general notions, nor regulates all its love and hatred by the universal, abstract differences of vice and virtue, without regard to self, or the persons with whom we are more intimately connected, yet have these moral differences a considerable influence, and being sufficient, at least, for discourse, serve all our purposes, in company, in the pulpit, on the theatre, and in the schools *

Thus, in whatever light we take this subject, the merit ascribed to the social virtues appears still uniform, and arises chiefly from that regard which the natural sentiment of benevolence engages us to pay to the interests of mankind and society If we consider the principles of the human make, such as they appear to daily experience and observation, we must, *a priori*, conclude it impossible for such a creature as man to be totally indifferent to the well or ill-being of his fellow-creatures, and not readily, of himself, to pronounce, where nothing gives him any particular bias, that what promotes their happiness is

* It is wisely ordained by nature, that private connections should commonly prevail over universal views and considerations otherwise our affections and actions would be dissipated and lost for want of a proper limited object. Thus a small benefit done to ourselves or our near friends, excites more lively sentiments of love and approbation, than a great benefit done to a distant commonwealth; but still we know here, as in all the senses, to correct these inequalities by reflection, and retain a general standard of vice and virtue, founded chiefly on general usefulness.

good, what tends to their misery is evil, without any farther regard or consideration Here then are the faint rudiments, at least, or outlines, of a *general* distinction between actions, and in proportion as the humanity of the person is supposed to increase, his connection with those who are injured or benefited, and his lively conception of their misery or happiness, his consequent censure or approbation acquires proportionable vigour There is no necessity, that a generous action, barely mentioned in an old history or remote gazette, should communicate any strong feelings of applause and admiration Virtue, placed at such a distance, is like a fixed star, which, though to the eye of reason it may appear as luminous as the sun in his meridian, is so infinitely removed, as to affect the senses neither with light nor heat Bring this virtue nearer, by our acquaintance or connection with the persons, or even by an eloquent recital of the case, our hearts are immediately caught, our sympathy enlivened, and our cool approbation converted into the warmest sentiments of friendship and regard. These seem necessary and infallible consequences of the general principles of human nature, as discovered in common life and practice

Again, reverse these views and reasonings consider the matter *a posteriori*, and weighing the consequences, inquire if the merit of social virtue be not, in a great measure, derived from the feelings of humanity, with which it affects the spectators It appears to be matter of fact, that the circumstance of *utility*, in all subjects, is a source of praise and approbation that it is constantly appealed to in all moral decisions concerning the merit and demerit of actions that it is the *sole* source of that high regard paid to justice, fidelity, honour allegiance, and chastity that it is inseparable from all the other social virtues, humanity, generosity, charity, affability, lenity, mercy, and moderation and, in a word, it is a foundation of the chief part of morals, which has a reverence to mankind and our fellow creatures.

It appears also, that, in our general approbation of characters and manners, the useful tendency of the social virtues moves us not by any regards to self-interest, but has an influence much more universal and extensive It appears that a tendency to public good, and to the promoting of peace, harmony, and order in society, does always, by affecting the benevolent principles of our frame, engage us on the side of the social virtues. And it appears, as an additional confirmation, that these principles of humanity and sympathy enter so deeply into all our sentiments, and have so powerful an influence, as may enable them to excite the strongest censure and applause The present theory is the simple result of all these inferences, each of which seems founded on uniform experience and observation.

Were it doubtful, whether there were any such principle in our nature as humanity or a concern for others, yet when we see, in numberless instances, that whatever has a tendency to promote the

interest of society, is so highly approved of we ought thence to learn the force of the benevolent principle, since it is impossible for any thing to please as means to an end, where the end is totally indifferent. On the other hand, were it doubtful, whether there were implanted in our nature any general principle of moral blame and approbation, yet when we see, in numberless instances, the influence of humanity, we ought thence to conclude, that it is impossible, but that every thing which promotes the interests of society, must communicate pleasure, and what is pernicious give uneasiness But when these different reflections and observations concur in establishing the same conclusion, must they not bestow an undisputed evidence upon it?

It is, however, hoped that the progress of this argument will bring a farther confirmation of the present theory, by showing the rise of other sentiments of esteem and regard from the same or like principles

---

SECTION VI —OF QUALITIES USEFUL TO OURSELVES.

PART I —It seems evident, that where a quality or habit is subjected to our examination, if it appear, in anv respect, prejudicial to the person possessed of it, or such as incapacitates him for business and action, it is instantly blamed, and ranked among his faults and imperfections Indolence, negligence, want of order and method, obstinacy, fickleness, rashness, credulity, these qualities were never esteemed by any one indifferent to a character, much less extolled as accomplishments or virtues The prejudice, resulting from them, immediately strikes our eye, and gives us the sentiment of pain and disapprobation

No quality, it is allowed, is absolutely either blameable or praiseworthy It is all according to its degree A due medium, says the PERIPATETICS, is the characteristic of virtue But this medium is chiefly determined by utility A proper celerity, for instance, and dispatch in business, is commendable When defective, no progress is ever made in the execution of any purpose when excessive, it engages us in precipitate and ill-concerted measures and enterprizes. by such reasonings, we fix the proper and commendable mediocrity in all moral and prudential disquisitions, and never lose view of the advantages which result from any character or habit.

Now as these advantages are enjoyed by the person possessed of the character, it can never be *self-love* which renders the prospect of them agreeable to us, the spectators, and prompts our esteem and approbation. No force of imagination can convert us into another person, and make us fancy, that we, being that person, reap benefit from those valuable qualities, which belong to him. Or if it did, no celerity of

imagination could immediately transport us back into ourselves, and make us love and esteem the person, as different from us. Views and sentiments, so opposite to known truth, and to each other, could never have place, at the same time, in the same person. All suspicion, therefore, of selfish regards, is here totally excluded. It is a quite different principle, which actuates our bosom, and interests us in the felicity of the person whom we contemplate. Where his natural talents and acquired abilities give us the prospect of elevation, advancement, a figure in life, prosperous success, a steady command over fortune, and the execution of great or advantageous undertakings; we are struck with such agreeable images, and feel a complacency and regard immediately arise towards him. The ideas of happiness, joy, triumph, prosperity, are connected with every circumstance of his character, and diffuse over our minds a pleasing sentiment of sympathy and humanity.*

Let us suppose a person originally framed so as to have no manner of concern for his fellow-creatures, but to regard the happiness and misery of all sensible beings with greater indifference than even two contiguous shades of the same colour. Let us suppose, if the prosperity of nations were laid on the one hand, and their ruin on the other, and he were desired to chuse, that he would stand like the schoolman's ass, irresolute and undetermined, between equal motives; or rather, like the same ass between two pieces of wood or marble, without any inclination or propensity to either side. The consequence, I believe, must be allowed just, that such a person, being absolutely unconcerned, either for the public good of a community, or the private utility of others, would look on every quality, however pernicious, or however beneficial, to society, or to its possessor, with the same indifference as on the most common and uninteresting object.

But if, instead of this fancied monster, we suppose a *man* to form a judgment or determination in the case, there is to him a plain foundation of preference, where every thing else is equal; and however cool his choice may be, if his heart be selfish, or if the persons interested be remote from him, there must still be a choice or distinction between what is useful, and what is pernicious. Now this distinction is the same in all its parts, with the *moral distinction*, whose foundation has been so often, and so much in vain, inquired

* One may venture to affirm, that there is no human creature, to whom the appearance of happiness (where envy or revenge has no place) does not give pleasure; that of misery, uneasiness. This seems inseparable from our make and constitution. But they are only the more generous minds that are thence prompted to seek zealously the good of others, and to have a real passion for their welfare. With men of narrow and ungenerous spirits this sympathy goes not beyond a slight feeling of the imagination, which serves only to excite sentiments of complacency or censure, and makes them apply to the object either honourable or dishonourable appellations. A griping miser, for instance, praises extremely industry and frugality even in others, and sets them, in his estimation, above all the other virtues. He knows the good that results from them, and feels that species of happiness with a more lively sympathy, than any other you could represent to him; though perhaps he would not part with a shilling to make the fortune of the industrious man whom he praises so highly.

after The same endowments of the mind, in every circumstance, are agreeable to the sentiment of morals and to that of humanity; the same temper is susceptible of high degrees of the one sentiment and of the other, and the same alteration in the objects, by their nearer approach or by connections, enlivens the one and the other By all the rules of philosophy, therefore, we must conclude, that these sentiments are originally the same, since, in each particular, even the most minute, they are governed by the same laws, and are moved by the same objects

Why do philosophers infer with the greatest certainty, that the moon is kept in its orbit by the same force of gravity, that makes bodies fall near the surface of the earth, but because these effects are upon computation, found similar and equal? And must not this argument bring as strong conviction, in moral as in natural disquisitions?

To prove, by any long detail, that all the qualities, useful to the possessor, are approved of, and the contrary censured, would be superfluous. The least reflection on what is every day experienced in life will be sufficient We shall only mention a few instances, in order to remove, if possible, all doubt and hesitation

The quality, the most necessary for the execution of any useful enterprize, is DISCRETION, by which we carry on the safe intercourse with others, give due attention to our own and to their character, weigh each circumstance of the business which we undertake, and employ the surest and safest means for the attainment of any end or purpose. To a CROMWELL, perhaps, or a DE RETZ, discretion may appear an alderman-like virtue, as Dr Swift calls it, and being incompatible with those vast designs, to which their courage and ambition prompted them, it might really, in them, be a fault, or imperfection But in the conduct of ordinary life, no virtue is more requisite, not only to obtain success, but to avoid the most fatal miscarriages and disappointments The greatest parts without it, as observed by an elegant writer, may be fatal to their owner, as Polyphemus, deprived of his eye, was only the more exposed, on account of his enormous strength and stature.

The best character, indeed, were it not rather too perfect for human nature, is that which is not swayed by temper of any kind, but alternately employs enterprize and caution, as each is *useful* to the particular purpose intended. Such is the excellence with St. Evremond ascribes to Mareschal Turenne, who displayed in every campaign, as he grew older, more temerity in his military enterprises, and being now, from long experience, perfectly acquainted with every incident in war, he advanced with great firmness and security, in a road so well known to him. Fabius, says Machiavel, was cautious, Scipio enterprising and both succeeded, because the situation, of the Roman

affairs, during the command of each was peculiarly adapted to his genius; but both would have failed had these situations been reversed. He is happy, whose circumstances suit his temper, but he is more excellent, who can suit his temper to any circumstances

What need is there to display the praises of INDUSTRY, and to extol its advantages, the acquisition of power and riches, or in raising what we call a *fortune* in the world? The tortoise, according to the fable, by his perseverance, gained the race of the hare, though possessed of much superior swiftness A man's time, when well husbanded, is like a cultivated field, of which a few acres produce more of what is useful to life, than extensive provinces, even of the richest soil, when over-run with weeds and brambles

But all prospect of success in life, or even of tolerable subsistence, must fail, where a reasonable FRUGALITY is wanting The heap instead of increasing, diminishes daily, and leaves its possessor so much more unhappy, as, not having been able to confine his expenses to a large revenue, he will still less be able to live contentedly on a small one The souls of men, according to Plato, [Phædo] inflamed with impure appetites, and losing the body, which alone afforded means of satisfaction, hover about the earth, and haunt the places where their bodies are deposited, possessed with a longing desire to recover the lost organs of sensation So may we see worthless prodigals, having consumed their fortune in wild debauches, thrusting themselves into every plentiful table, and every party of pleasure, hated even by the vicious, and despised even by fools

The one extreme of frugality is *avarice*, which, as it both deprives a man of all use of his riches, and checks hospitality and every social enjoyment, is justly censured on a double account *Prodigality*, the other extreme, is commonly more hurtful to a man himself, and each of these extremes is blamed above the other, according to the temper of the person who censures, and according to his greater or less sensibility to pleasure, either social or sensual

Qualities often derive their merit from complicated sources. *Honesty*, *fidelity*, *truth*, are praised for their immediate tendency to promote the interests of society, but after those virtues are once established upon this foundation, they are also considered as advantageous to the person himself, and as the source of that trust and confidence, which can alone give a man any consideration in life. One becomes contemptible, no less that odious when he forgets the duty, which, in this particular, he owes to himself, as well as to society.

All men, it is allowed, are equally desirous of happiness, but few are successful in the pursuit one considerable cause is the want of STRENGTH of MIND, which might enable them to resist the temptation of present ease or pleasure, and carry them forward in the search

of more distant profit and enjoyment. Our affections, on a general prospect of their objects, form certain rules of conduct, and certain measures of preference of one above another and these decisions, though really the result of our calm passions and propensities, (for what else can pronounce any object eligible, or the contrary), are yet said, by a natural abuse of terms, to be the determinations of pure *reason* and reflection But when some of these objects approach nearer to us, or acquire the advantages of favourable lights and positions which catch the heart or imagination, our general resolutions are frequently confounded, a small enjoyment preferred, and lasting shame and sorrow entailed upon us And however poets may employ their wit and eloquence, in celebrating present pleasure, and rejecting all distant views to fame, health, or fortune, it is obvious that this practice is the source of all dissoluteness and disorder, repentance and misery A man of a strong and determined temper adheres tenaciously to his general resolutions, and is neither seduced by the allurements of pleasure, nor terrified by the menaces of pain, but keeps still in view those distant pursuits, by which he at once ensures his happiness and his honour

Self-satisfaction, at least in some degree, is an advantage which equally attends the FOOL and the WISE MAN, but it is the only one, nor is there any other circumstance in the conduct of life, where they are upon an equal footing Business, books, conversation for all of these, a fool is totally incapacitated, and, except condemned by his station to the coarsest drudgery, remains a *useless* burthen upon the earth Accordingly, it is found, that men are extremely jealous of their character in this particular, and many instances are seen of profligacy and treachery, the most avowed and unreserved, none of bearing patiently the imputation of ignorance and stupidity. Dicaearchus the Macedonian general, who, as Polybius tells us [Lib. xvii cap 35], openly erected one altar to impiety, another to injustice, in order to bid defiance to mankind, even he, I am well assured, would have started at the epithet of *fool*, and have meditated revenge for so injurious an appellation Except the affection of parents, the strongest and most indissoluble bond in nature, no connection has strength sufficient to support the disgust arising from this character. Love itself, which can subsist under treachery, ingratitude, malice, and infidelity, is immediately extinguished by it, when perceived and acknowledged, nor are deformity and old age more fatal to the dominion of that passion So dreadful are the ideas of an utter incapacity for any purpose or undertaking, and of continued error and misconduct in life!

When it is asked, whether a quick or a slow apprehension be most valuable? Whether one, that, at first view, penetrates far into a subject, but can perform nothing upon study; or a contrary character

which must work out every thing by dint of application? Whether a clear head or a copious invention? Whether a profound genius or a sure judgment? In short, what character, or peculiar turn of understanding is more excellent than another? It is evident that we can answer none of these questions, without considering which of those qualities capacitates a man best for the world, and carries him farthest in any undertaking.

If refined sense and exalted sense be not so *useful* as common sense, their rarity, their novelty, and the nobleness of their objects, make some compensation, and render them the admiration of mankind: as gold, though less serviceable than iron, acquires, from its scarcity, a value which is much superior.

The defects of judgment can be supplied by no art or invention; but those of MEMORY frequently may, both in business and in study, by method and industry, and by diligence in committing every thing to writing; and we scarcely ever hear a short memory given as a reason for a man's failure in any undertaking. But in ancient times, when no man could make a figure without the talent of speaking, and when the audience were too delicate to bear such crude, undigested harangues as our extemporary orators offer to public assemblies; the faculty of memory was then of the utmost consequence, and was accordingly much more valued than at present. Scarce any great genius is mentioned in antiquity, who is not celebrated for this talent; and Cicero enumerates it among the other sublime qualities of Cæsar himself.*

Particular customs and manners alter the usefulness of qualities: they also alter their merit. Particular situations and accidents have, in some degree, the same influence. He will always be more esteemed who possesses those talents and accomplishments which suit his station and profession, than he whom fortune has misplaced in the part which she has assigned him. The private or selfish virtues are, in this respect, more arbitrary than the public and social. In other respects, they are perhaps, less liable to doubt and controversy.

In this kingdom, such continued ostentation, of late years, has prevailed among men in *active* life with regard to *public spirit*, and among those in *speculative* with regard to *benevolence*; and so many false pretensions to each have been, no doubt, detected, that men of the world are apt, without any bad intention, to discover a sudden incredulity on the head of those moral endowments, and even sometimes absolutely to deny their existence and reality. In like manner, I find that, of old, the perpetual cant of the *Stoics* and *Cynics* concerning virtue, their magnificent professions and slender performances, bred a disgust in mankind; and Lucian, who, though licentious with regard

* Fuit in illo ingenium, ratio, memoria, literæ, cura, cogitatio, diligentia, &c. Philip. 2.

to pleasure, is yet, in other respects, a very moral writer, cannot sometimes talk of virtue, so much boasted, without betraying symptoms of spleen and irony.* But surely this peevish delicacy, whencesoever it arises, can never be carried so far as to make us deny the existence of every species of merit, and all distinction of manners and behaviour. Besides *discretion*, *caution*, *enterprise*, *industry*, *frugality*, *economy*, *good-sense*, *prudence*, *discernment*; besides these endowments, I say, whose very names force an avowal of their merit, there are many others, to which the most determined scepticism cannot, for a moment, refuse the tribute of praise and approbation. *Temperance*, *sobriety*, *patience*, *constancy*, *perseverance*, *forethought*, *considerateness*, *secrecy*, *order*, *insinuation*, *address*, *presence of mind*, *quickness of conception*, *facility of expression*; these, and a thousand more of the same kind, no man will ever deny to be excellencies and perfections. As their merit consists in their tendency to serve the person possessed of them, without any magnificent claim to public and social desert, we are the less jealous of their pretensions, and readily admit them into the catalogue of laudable qualities. We are not sensible, that, by this concession, we have paved the way for all the other moral excellencies, and cannot consistently hesitate any longer, with regard to disinterested benevolence, patriotism, and humanity.

It seems, indeed, certain, that first appearances are here, as usual, extremely deceitful, and that it is more difficult, in a speculative way, to resolve into self-love the merit which we ascribe to the selfish virtues above mentioned, than that even of the social virtues, justice and beneficence. For this latter purpose, we need but say, that whatever conduct promotes the good of the community, is loved, praised, and esteemed by the community, on account of that utility and interest of which every one partakes: and though this affection and regard be, in reality, gratitude, not self-love, yet a distinction, even of this obvious nature, may not readily be made by superficial reasoners; and there is room, at least, to support the cavil and dispute for a moment. But as qualities, which tend only to the utility of their possessor, without any reference to us, or to the community, are yet esteemed and valued; by what theory or system can we account for this sentiment from self-love, or deduce it from that favourite origin? There seems here a necessity for confessing that the happiness and misery of others are not spectacles entirely indifferent to us; but that the view of the former, whether in its causes or effects, like sunshine, or the prospect of well-cultivated plains (to carry our pretensions no higher), can

* Αρετην τινα και ασωματα και ληρους μεγαλη τη φωνη ξυνειροντων. Luc. Timon. Again, Και συναγαγοντες (οι φιλοσοφοι) ευεξαπατητα μειρακια την τε [illegible] αρετην τραγωδουσι. Icaromen. In another place, Η που γαρ εστιν η [illegible] αρετη, και φυσις, και ειμαρμενη, και τυχη, ανυποστατα και κενα πραγματων [illegible]. Deor. Concil.

municates a secret joy and satisfaction; the appearance of the latter, like a lowering cloud or barren landscape, throws a melancholy damp over the imagination And this concession being once made, the difficulty is over, and a natural unforced interpretation of the phenomena of human life will afterwards, we hope, prevail among all speculative inquirers

PART II —It may not be improper, in this place, to examine the influence of bodily endowments, and of the goods of fortune, over our sentiments of regard and esteem, and to consider whether these phenomena fortify or weaken the present theory It will naturally be expected, that the beauty of the body, as is supposed by all ancient moralists, will be similar, in some respects, to that of the mind, and that every kind of esteem, which is paid to a man, will have something similar in its origin, whether it arise from his mental endowments, or from the situation of his exterior circumstances

It is evident, that one considerable source of *beauty* in all animals is the advantage which they reap from the particular structure of their limbs and members, suitably to the particular manner of life, to which they are by nature destined The just proportions of a horse described by Xenophon and Virgil, are the same that are received at this day by our modern jockeys, because the foundation of them is the same, namely, experience of what is detrimental or useful in the animal

Broad shoulders, a lank belly, firm joints, taper legs, all these are beautiful in our species, because signs of force and vigour Ideas of utility and its contrary, though they do not entirely determine what is handsome or deformed, are evidently the source of a considerable part of approbation or dislike

In ancient times, bodily strength and dexterity, being of greater *use* and importance in war, was also much more esteemed and valued than at present Not to insist on Homer and the poets, we may observe, that historians scruple not to mention *force of body* among the other accomplishments even of Epaminondas, whom they acknowledge to be the greatest hero, statesmen, and general, of all the Greeks.* A like praise is given to Pompey, one of the greatest of the Romans † This instance is similar to what we observed above, with regard to memory

There is no rule in painting or statuary more indispensable than that of balancing the figures, and placing them with the greatest exact-

* Diodorus Siculus, lib. xv It may not be improper to give the character of Epaminondas, as drawn by the historian, in order to show the ideas of perfect merit which prevailed in those ages. In other illustrious men, says he, you will observe that each possessed some one shining quality, which was the foundation of his fame in Epaminondas all the *virtues* are found united, force of body, eloquence of expression, vigour of mind, contempt of riches, gentleness of disposition, and, *what is chiefly to be regarded*, courage and conduct in war.

† *Cum alacribus, saltu, cum velocibus, cursu cum validis recte certabat.* Sallust apud Veget.

ness on their proper centre of gravity. A figure, which is not justly balanced, is ugly; because it conveys the disagreeable ideas of fall, harm, and pain.*

A disposition or turn of mind, which qualifies a man to rise in the world, and advance his fortune, is entitled to esteem and regard, as has already been explained. It may, therefore, naturally be supposed, that the actual possession of riches and authority will have a considerable influence over these sentiments.

Let us examine any hypothesis, by which we can account for the regard paid to the rich and powerful; we shall find none satisfactory, but that which derives it from the enjoyment communicated to the spectator by the images of prosperity, happiness, ease, plenty, authority, and the gratification of every appetite. Self-love, for instance, which some affect so much to consider as the source of every sentiment, is plainly insufficient for this purpose. Where no good-will or friendship appears, it is difficult to conceive on what we can found our hope of advantage from the riches of others; though we naturally respect the rich, even before they discover any such favourable disposition towards us.

We are affected with the same sentiments, when we lie so much out of the sphere of their activity, that they cannot even be supposed to possess the power of serving us. A prisoner of war, in all civilized nations, is treated with a regard suited to his condition; and riches, it is evident, go far towards fixing the condition of any person. If birth and quality enter for a share, this still affords us an argument to our present purpose. For what is it we call a man of birth, but one who is descended from a long succession of rich and powerful ancestors, and who acquired our esteem by his connection with persons whom we esteem? His ancestors, therefore, though dead, are respected in some measure, on account of their riches; and consequently, without any kind of expectation.

But not to go so far as prisoners of war or the dead, to find instances of this disinterested regard for riches, we may only observe, with a little attention, those phenomena, which occur in common life and conversation. A man, who is himself, we shall suppose, of a competent fortune, and of no profession, being introduced to a company of strangers, naturally treats them with different degrees of respect, as he

* All men are equally liable to pain, and disease, and sickness; and may again recover health and ease. These circumstances, as they make no distinction between one man and another, are no source of pride or humility, regard or contempt. But comparing our own species to superior ones, it is a very mortifying consideration, that we should all be so liable to disease and infirmities; and divines accordingly employ this topic in order to depress self-conceit and vanity. They would have more success if the common bent of our thoughts were not perpetually turned to compare ourselves with others. The infirmities of old age are mortifying, because a comparison with the young may take place. The king's evil is industriously concealed, because it affects others, and is often transmitted to posterity. The case is nearly the same with such diseases as convey any nauseous or frightful images; the epilepsy, for instance, ulcers, sores, scabs, &c.

is informed of their different fortunes and conditions, though it is impossible that he can so suddenly propose, and perhaps he would not accept of, any pecuniary advantage from them. A traveller is always admitted into company, and meets with civility, in proportion as his train and equipage speak him a man of great or moderate fortune. In short, the different ranks of men are, in a great measure, regulated by riches; and that with regard to superiors as well as inferiors, strangers as well as acquaintance.

What remains, therefore, but to conclude, that, as riches are desired for ourselves only as the means of gratifying our appetites, either at present or in some imaginary future period, they beget esteem in others merely from their having that influence. This indeed is their very nature or essence: they have a direct reference to the commodities, conveniences, and pleasures of life: the bill of a banker, who is broke, or gold in a desert island, would otherwise be full as valuable. When we approach a man, who is, as we say, at his ease, we are presented with the pleasing ideas of plenty, satisfaction, cleanliness, warmth, a cheerful house, elegant furniture, ready service, and whatever is desirable in meat, drink, or apparel. On the contrary, when a poor man appears, the disagreeable images of want, penury, hard labour, dirty furniture, coarse or ragged clothes, nauseous meat and distasteful liquor, immediately strike our fancy. What else do we mean by saying that one is rich, the other poor? And as regard or contempt is the natural consequence of those different situations in life, it is easily seen what additional light and evidence this throws on our preceding theory, with regard to all moral distinctions.*

A man, who has cured himself of all ridiculous prepossessions, and is fully, sincerely, and steadily convinced, from experience as well as philosophy, that the difference of fortune makes less difference in happiness than is vulgarly imagined, such a one does not measure out degrees of esteem according to the rent-rolls of his acquaintance. He may, indeed, externally pay a superior deference to the great lord above the vassal, because riches are the most convenient, being the most fixed and determinate source of distinction: but his internal sentiments are more regulated by the personal characters of men, than by the accidental and capricious favours of fortune.

* There is something extraordinary and seemingly unaccountable, in the operation of our passions, when we consider the fortune and situation of others. Very often another's advancement and prosperity produces envy, which has a strong mixture of hatred, and arises chiefly from the comparison of ourselves with the person. At the very same time, or at least in very short intervals, we may feel the passion of respect, which is a species of affection or good-will, with a mixture of humility. On the other hand, the misfortunes of our fellows often cause pity, which has in it a strong mixture of good will. This sentiment of pity is nearly allied to contempt, which is a species of dislike, with a mixture of pride. I only point out these phenomena as a subject of speculation to such as are curious with regard to moral enquiries. It is sufficient for the present purpose to observe in general, that power and riches commonly cause respect, poverty and meanness contempt, though particular views and incidents may sometimes raise the passions of envy and of pity.

In most countries of Europe, family, that is, hereditary riches, marked with titles and symbols from the sovereign, is the chief source of distinction. In England, more regard is paid to present opulence and plenty. Each practice has its advantages and disadvantages. Where birth is respected, unactive, spiritless minds, remain in haughty indolence, and dream of nothing but pedigrees and genealogies: the generous and ambitious seek honour, and authority, and reputation, and favour. Where riches are the chief idol, corruption, venality, rapine prevail: arts, manufactures, commerce, agriculture flourish. The former prejudice, being favourable to military vice, is more suited to monarchies. The latter, being the chief spur to industry, agrees better with a republican government. And we accordingly find, that each of these forms of government, by varying the *utility* of those customs, has commonly a proportionable effect on the sentiments of mankind.

SECTION VII.—OF QUALITIES IMMEDIATELY AGREEABLE TO OURSELVES

WHOEVER has passed an evening with serious melancholy people, and has observed how suddenly the conversation was animated, and what sprightliness diffused itself over the countenance, discourse, and behaviour of every one, on the accession of a good-humoured, lively companion; such a one will easily allow, that CHEERFULNESS carries great merit with it, and naturally conciliates the good-will of mankind. No quality, indeed, more readily communicates itself to all around; because no one has a greater propensity to display itself, in jovial talk and pleasant entertainment. The flame spreads through the whole circle; and the most sullen and morose are often caught by it. That the melancholy hate the merry, even though Horace says it, I have some difficulty to allow; because I have always observed, that, where the jollity is moderate and decent, serious people are so much the more delighted, as it dissipates the gloom, with which they are commonly oppressed, and gives them an unusual enjoyment.

From this influence of cheerfulness, both to communicate itself, and to engage approbation, we may perceive, that there is another set of mental qualities, which, without any utility or any tendency to farther good either of the community or of the possessor, diffuse a satisfaction on the beholders, and procure friendship and regard. Their immediate sensation to the person possessed of them, is agreeable: others enter into the same humour, and catch the sentiment, by a contagion or natural sympathy; and as we cannot forbear loving whatever pleases, a kindly emotion arises towards the person, who

communicates so much satisfaction He is a more animating spectacle his presence diffuses over us more serene complacency and enjoyment our imagination, entering into his feelings and disposition, is affected in a more agreeable manner, than if a melancholy, dejected, sullen, anxious temper were presented to us Hence the affection and approbation, which attend the former the aversion and disgust, with which we regard the latter *

Few men would envy the character, which Cæsar gives of Cassius.

He loves no play,
As thou do'st, Anthony he hears no music
Seldom he smiles, and smiles in such a sort,
As if he mock'd himself, and scorn'd his spirit
That could be mov'd to smile at any thing

Not only such men, as Cæsar adds, are commonly *dangerous*, but also, having little enjoyment within themselves, they can never become agreeable to others, or contribute to social entertainment In all polite nations and ages, a relish for pleasure, if accompanied with temperance and decency, is esteemed a considerable merit, even in the greatest men, and becomes still more requisite in those of inferior rank and character It is an ageeable representation, which a French writer gives of the situation of his own mind in this particular, *Virtue I love*, says he, *without austerity, pleasure without effeminacy, and life without fearing its end* †

Who is not struck with any signal instance of GREATNESS of MIND or Dignity of Character, with elevation of sentiment, disdain of slavery, and with that noble pride and spirit which arises from conscious virtue? The sublime, says Longinus, is often nothing but the echo or image of magnanimity, and where this quality appears in any one, even though a syllable be not uttered it excites our applause and admiration, as may be observed of the famous silence of AJAX in the ODYSSEY, which expresses more noble disdain and resolute indignation than any language can convey [Cap 9]

Were I ALEXANDER, said PARMENIO, *I would accept of these offers made by Darius*—*So would I too*, replied ALEXANDER, *were I* PARMENIO This saying is admirable, says Longinus, from a like principle. [Idem.]

Go! cries the same hero to his soldiers, when they refused to follow him to the INDIES, *go, tell your countrymen, that you left* ALEXANDER *completing the conquest of the world*—'ALEXANDER,' said the Prince

* There is no man who, on particular occasions, is not affected with all the disagreeable passions, fear, anger, dejection, grief, melancholy, anxiety, &c. But these so far as they are natural and universal, make no difference between one man and another, and can never be the object of blame It is only when the disposition gives a *propensity* to any of these disagreeable passions, that they disfigure the character, and, by giving uneasiness, convey the sentiment of disapprobation to the spectator.

† 'J'aime la vertu, sans rudesse; 'J'aime le plaisir, sans molesse;
'J'aime la vie, et n'en crains point la fin.'—St. Evremond.

'of Conde, who always admired this passage, 'abandoned by his 'soldiers among Barbarians, not yet fully subdued, felt in himself such 'a dignity and right of empire, that he could not believe it possible, 'that any one would refuse to obey him. Whether in EUROPE or in 'ASIA, among GREEKS or PERSIANS, all was indifferent to him: 'Wherever he found men, he fancied he should find subjects.'

The confidant of MEDEA in the tragedy recommends caution and submission, and enumerating all the distresses of that unfortunate heroine, asks her, what she has to support her against her numerous and implacable enemies? *Myself*, replies she, *Myself, I say, and it is enough*. Boileau justly recommends this passage as an instance of true sublime. [Reflection X. sur LONGIN.]

When Phocion, the modest and gentle Phocion, was led to execution, he turned to one of his fellow-sufferers, who was lamenting his own hard fate, *Is it not glory enough for you*, says he, *that you die with* PHOCION? [PLUTARCH in PHOC.]

Place in opposition the picture which Tacitus draws of VITELLIUS, fallen from empire, prolonging his ignominy from a wretched love of life, delivered over to the merciless rabble, tossed, buffetted, and kicked about, constrained, by their holding a poignard under his chin, to raise his head, and expose himself to every contumely. What abject infamy! What low humiliation! Yet even here, says the historian, he discovered some symptoms of a mind not wholly degenerate. To a tribune, who insulted him, he replied, *I am still your emperor*.*

We never excuse the absolute want of spirit and dignity of character, or a proper sense of what is due to one's self, in society and the common intercourse of life. This vice constitutes what we properly call *mearness*, when a man can submit to the basest slavery, in order to gain his ends, fawn upon those who abuse him, and degrade himself by intimacies and familiarities with undeserving inferiors. A certain degree of generous pride or self-value is so requisite, that the absence of it in the mind displeases, after the same manner as the want of a nose, eye, or any of the most material features of the face or member of the body.†

* Tacit. hist. lib. iii. The author entering upon the narration, says *Laniata veste, fœdum spectaculum ducebatur, multis increpantibus, nullo in la rimente*: deformitas exitus misericordiam abstulerat. To enter thoroughly into this method of thinking, we must make allowance for the ancient maxims, that no one ought to proleng his life after it became dishonourable; but, as he had always a right to dispose of it, it then became a duty to part with it.

† The absence of virtue may often be a vice, and that of the highest kind; as in the instance of ingratitude, as well as meanness. Where we expect a beauty, the disappointment gives an uneasy sensation, and produces a real deformity. An abjectness of character, likewise, is disgustful and contemptible in another view. Where a man has no sense of value in himself, we are not likely to have any higher esteem of him. And if the same person, who crouches to his superiors, is insolent to his inferiors (as often happens), this contrariety of behaviour, instead of correcting the former vice, aggravates it extremely, by the addition of a vice still more odious. See Sect. 8.

The utility of COURAGE, both to the public and to the person possessed of it, is an obvious foundation of merit but to any one who duly considers of the matter, it will appear that this quality has a peculiar lustre, which it derives wholly from itself, and from that noble elevation inseparable from it. Its figure, drawn by painters and by poets, displays, in each feature, a sublimity and daring confidence, which catches the eye, engages the affections, and diffuses, by sympathy, a like sublimity of sentiment over every spectator

Under what shining colours does Demosthenes [Pro corona.] represent Philip, where the orator apologizes for his own administration, and justifies that pertinacious love of liberty, with which he had inspired the Athenians 'I beheld Philip,' says he, 'he with whom was 'your contest, resolutely, while in pursuit of empire and dominion, 'exposing himself to every wound, his eye gored, his neck wrested, 'his arm, his thigh pierced, whatever part of his body fortune should 'seize on, that cheerfully relinquishing, provided, that with what re-'mained, he might live in honour and renown And shall it be said, 'that he, born in Pella, a place heretofore mean and ignoble, should 'be inspired with so high an ambition and thirst of fame while you, 'Athenians' &c These praises excite the most lively admiration, but the views presented by the orator carry us not, we see, beyond the hero himself, nor ever regard the future advantageous consequences of his valour

The martial temper of the Romans, inflamed by continual wars, had raised their esteem of courage so high, that, in their language it was called *virtue*, by way of excellence and of distinction from all other moral qualities *The Suevi*, in the opinion of Tacitus, [De Moribus Germ] *dressed their hair with a laudable intent not for the purpose of loving or being loved they adorned themselves only for their enemies, and in order to appear more terrible* A sentiment of the historian, which would sound a little oddly in other nations and other ages

The Scythians, according to Herodotus, [Lib iv] after scalping their enemies, dressed the skin like leather, and used it as a towel, and whoever had the most of those towels was most esteemed among them. So much had martial bravery, in that nation, as well as in many others, destroyed the sentiments of humanity, a virtue surely much more useful and engaging

It is indeed observable, that, among all uncultivated nations, who have not, as yet, had full experience of the advantages attending beneficence, justice, and the social virtues, courage is the predominant excellence, what is most celebrated by poets, recommended by parents and instructors, and admired by the public in general. The ethics of Homer are, in this particular, very different from those of Fenelon, his elegant imitator, and such as were well suited to an age, when

the hero, as remarked by Thucydides, [Lib. i.] could ask another without offence, whether he were a robber or not. Such also, very lately, was the system of ethics which prevailed in many barbarous parts of Ireland; if we may credit Spencer, in his judicious account of the state of that kingdom.*

Of the same class of virtues with courage is that undisturbed philosophical TRANQUILLITY, superior to pain, sorrow, anxiety, and each assault of adverse fortune. Conscious of his own virtue, say the philosophers, the sage elevates himself above every accident of life; and, securely placed in the temple of wisdom, looks down on inferior mortals, engaged in pursuit of honours, riches, reputation, and every frivolous enjoyment. These pretensions, no doubt, when stretched to the utmost, are, by far, too magnificent for human nature. They carry, however, a grandeur with them which seizes the spectator, and strikes him with admiration. And the nearer we can approach in practice to this sublime tranquillity and indifference (for we must distinguish it from a stupid insensibility), the more secure enjoyment shall we attain within ourselves, and the more greatness of mind shall we discover to the world. The philosophical tranquillity may, indeed, be considered only as a branch of magnanimity.

Who admires not Socrates; his perpetual serenity and contentment, amidst the greatest poverty and domestic vexations; his resolute contempt of riches, and his magnanimous care of preserving liberty, while he refused all assistance from his friends and disciples, and avoided even the dependence of an obligation? Epictetus had not so much as a door to his little house or hovel, and therefore soon lost his iron lamp, the only furniture which he had worth taking. But resolving to dissappoint all robbers for the future, he supplied its place with an earthen lamp, of which he peaceably kept possession ever after.

Among the ancients, the heroes in philosophy, as well as those in war and patriotism, have a grandeur and force of sentiment, which astonishes our narrow souls, and is rashly rejected as extravagant and supernatural. They, in their turn, I allow, would have had equal reason to consider as romantic and incredible the degree of humanity, clemency, order, tranquillity, and other social virtues, to which, in the administration of government, we have attained in modern times, had any one been then able to have made a fair representation of them. Such is the compensation, which nature, or rather education, has made in the distribution of excellencies and virtues in different ages.

The merit of BENEVOLENCE, arising from its utility, and its tendency to promote the good of mankind, has already been explained, and is,

* It is a common use, says he, amongst their gentlemen's sons, that, as soon as they are able to use their weapons, they strait gather to themselves three or four stragglers or kern, with whom wandering a while up and down idly the country, taking only meat, he at last falleth into some bad occasion, that shall be offered; which being once made known, he is thenceforth counted a man of worth, in whom there is courage.

no doubt, the source of a *considerable* part of that esteem which is so universally paid to it. But it will also be allowed, that the very softness and tenderness of the sentiment, its engaging endearments, its fond expressions, its delicate attentions, and all that flow of mutual confidence and regard which enters into a warm attachment of love and friendship: it will be allowed, I say, that these feelings, being delightful in themselves, are necessarily communicated to the spectators, and melt them into the same fondness and delicacy. The tear naturally starts in our eye on the apprehension of a warm sentiment of this nature: our breast heaves, our heart is agitated, and every humane tender principle of our frame is set in motion, and gives us the purest and most satisfactory enjoyment.

When poets form descriptions of Elysian fields, where the blessed inhabitant stand in no need of each other's assistance, they yet represent them as maintaining a constant intercourse of love and friendship, and soothe our fancy with the pleasing image of these soft and gentle passions. The idea of tender tranquillity in a pastoral Arcadia is agreeable from a like principle.

Who would live amidst perpetual wrangling, and scolding, and mutual reproaches? The roughness and harshness of the emotions disturb and displease us: we suffer by contagion and sympathy; nor can we remain indifferent spectators, even though certain that no pernicious consequences would ever follow from such angry passions.

As a certain proof, that the whole merit of benevolence is not derived from its usefulness, we may observe, that, in a kind way of blame, we say, a person is *too good*, when he exceeds his part in society, and carries his attention for others beyond the proper bounds. In like manner, we say, a man is *too high spirited*, *too intrepid*, *too indifferent about fortune*: reproaches, which really, at bottom, imply more esteem than many panegyrics. Being accustomed to rate the merit and demerit of characters chiefly by their useful or pernicious tendencies, we cannot forbear applying the epithet of blame when we discover a sentiment which rises to a degree that is hurtful: but it may happen, at the same time, that its noble elevation, or its engaging tenderness so seizes the heart, as rather to increase our friendship and concern for the person.*

The amours of Harry IV. of France during the civil wars of the league, frequently hurt his interest and his cause; but all the young, who can sympathise with the tender passions, will allow, that this very weakness (for they will readily call it such) chiefly endears that hero, and interests them in his fortunes.

* Cheerfulness could scarce admit of blame from its excess, were it not that dissolute mirth, without a proper cause or subject, is a sure symptom and characteristic of folly, and on that account disgustful.

The excessive bravery and resolute inflexibility of Charles XII. ruined his own country, and infested all his neighbours, but have such splendour and greatness in their appearance, as strikes us with admiration, and they might, in some degree, be even approved of, if they betrayed not sometimes too evident sypmtoms of madness and disorder

The Athenians pretended to the first invention of agriculture and of laws, and always valued themselves extremely on the benefit thereby procured to the whole race of mankind. They also boasted, and with reason, of their warlike enterprises, particularly against those innumerable fleets and armies of Persians, which invaded Greece during the reigns of Darius and Xerxes But though there be no comparison, in point of utility, between these peaceful and military honours; yet we find, that the orators, who have writ such elaborate panegyrics on that famous city have chiefly triumphed in displaying the warlike achievements Lysias, Thucydides, Plato, and Isocrates, discover all of them, the same partiality, which, though condemned by calm reason and reflection, appears so natural in the mind of man.

It is observable, that the great charm of poetry consists in lively pictures of the sublime passions, magnanimity, courage, disdain of fortune, or those of the tender affections, love and friendship, which warm the heart, and diffuse over it similar sentiments and emotions And though all kinds of passion, even the most disagreeable, such as grief and anger, are observed, when excited by poetry, to convey a satisfaction, from a mechanism of nature, not easy to be explained yet those more elevated or softer affections have a peculiar influence, and please from more than cause or principle Not to mention, that they alone interest us in the fortune of the persons represented, or communicate any esteem and affection for their character.

And can it possibly be doubted, that this talent itself of poets, to move the passions, this PATHETIC and SUBLIME of sentiment, is a very considerable merit, and being enhanced by its extreme rarity, may exalt the person possesed of it, above every character of the age in which he lives? The prudence, address, steadiness, and benign government of AUGUSTUS, adorned with all the splendour of his noble birth and imperial crown, render him but an unequal competitor for fame with Virgil, who lays nothing into the opposite scale but the divine beauties of his poetical genius

The very sensibility to these beauties or a DELICACY of taste, is itself a beauty in any character, as conveying the purest, the most durable, and most innocent of all enjoyments.

There are some instances of the several species of merit, that are valued for the immediate pleasure which they communicate [illegible] person possessed of them. No views of utility or of [illegible] consequences enter into this sentiment of approbation; [illegible]

kind similar to that other sentiment, which arises from views of a public or private utility The same social sympathy, we may observe, or fellow-feeling with human happiness or misery, gives rise to both, and this analogy, in all the parts of the present theory, may justly be regarded as a confirmation of it

---

SECTION VIII.—OF QUALITIES IMMEDIATELY AGREEABLE TO OTHERS *

As the mutual shocks, in *society*, and the oppositions of interest and self-love, have constrained mankind to establish the laws of *justice*, in order to preserve the advantages of mutual assistance and protection in like manner, the eternal contrarieties, in *company*, of men's pride and self-conceit, have introduced the rules of GOOD-MANNERS or POLITENESS, in order to facilitate the intercourse of minds, and an undisturbed commerce and conversation Among well-bred people, a mutual deference is affected contempt of others disguised authority concealed attention given to each in his turn and an easy stream of conversation maintained, without vehemence, without interruption, without eagerness for victory, and without any airs of superiority These attentions and regards are immediately *agreeable* to others abstracted from any consideration of utility or beneficial tendencies they conciliate affection, promote esteem, and extremely enhance the merit of the person, who regulates his behaviour by them

Many of the forms of breeding are arbitrary and casual but the thing expressed by them is still the same A Spaniard goes out of his own house before his guest, to signify that he leaves him master of all In other countries the landlord walks out last, as a common mark of deference and regard

But, in order to render a man perfect *good company*, he must have WIT and INGENUITY as well as good manners What wit is, it may not be easy to define, but it is easy surely to determine, that it is a quality immediately *agreeable* to others, and communicating, on its first appearance, a lively joy and satisfaction to every one who has any comprehension of it The most profound metaphysics indeed, might be employed, in explaining the various kinds and species of wit, and many classes of it, which are now received on the sole testimony of taste and sentiment, might, perhaps, be resolved into more general principles. But this is sufficient for our present purpose, that it does

* It is the nature, and, indeed, the definition of virtue, that it is *a quality of the mind agreeable to or approved of by every one, who considers or contemplates it* But some qualities produce pleasure, because they are useful to society, or useful or agreeable to the person himself; others produce it more immediately; which is the case with the [illegible]

affect taste and sentiment, and bestowing an immediate enjoyment, is a sure source of approbation and affection.

In countries, where men pass most of their time in conversation, and visits, and assemblies, these *companionable* qualities, so to speak, are of high estimation, and form a chief part of personal merit In countries, where men live a more domestic life, and either are employed in business, or amuse themselves in a narrower circle of acquaintance, the more solid qualities are chiefly regarded Thus, I have often observed, that, among the French, the first questions, with regard to a stranger, are, *Is he polite? Has he wit?* In our country, the chief praise bestowed, is always that of a *good-natured, sensible fellow*

In conversation, the lively spirit of dialogue is *agreeable*, even to those who desire not to have any share in the discourse hence the teller of long stories, or the pompous declaimer, is very little approved of But most men desire likewise their turn in the conversation, and regard, with a very evil eye, that *loquacity*, which deprives them of a right they are naturally so jealous of

There is a sort of harmless *liars*, frequently to be met with in company, who deal much in the marvellous Their usual intention is to please and entertain, but as men are most delighted with what they conceive to be truth, these people mistake extremely the means of pleasing, and incur universal blame Some indulgence, however, to lying or fiction, is given in *humorous* stories, because it is there really agreeable and entertaining, and truth is not of any importance.

Eloquence, genius of all kinds, even good sense, and sound reasoning, when it rises to an eminent degree, and is employed upon subjects of any considerable dignity and nice discernment, all these endowments seem immediately agreeable, and have a merit distinct from their usefulness Rarity, likewise, which so much enhances the price of every thing, must set an additional value on these noble talents of the human mind

Modesty may be understood in different senses, even abstracted from chastity, which has been already treated of It sometimes means that tenderness and nicety of honour, that apprehension of blame, that dread of intrusion or injury towards others, that PUDOR, which is the proper guardian of every kind of virtue, and a sure preservative against vice and corruption But its most usual meaning is when it is opposed to *impudence* and *arrogance*, and expresses a diffidence of our own judgment, and a due attention and regard for others. In young men chiefly, this quality is a sure sign of good sense, and is also the certain means of augmenting that endowment, by preserving their ears open to instruction, and making them still grasp after new attainments. But it has a farther charm to every spectator; by flattering every man's vanity, and presenting the appearance of a docile pupil, who receives, with attention and respect, every word they utter

Men have, in general, a much greater propensity to over-value than under-value themselves, notwithstanding the opinion of Aristotle. [Ethic, ad Nicomachum] This makes us more jealous of the excess on the former side, and causes us to regard, with a peculiar indulgence, all tendency to modesty and self-diffidence, as esteeming the danger less of falling into any vicious extreme of that nature. It is thus, in countries, where men's bodies are apt to exceed in corpulence, personal beauty is placed in a much greater degree of slenderness, than in countries, where that is the most usual defect. Being so often struck with instances of one species of deformity, men think they can never keep at too great a distance from it, and wish always to have a leaning to the opposite side. In like manner, were the door opened to self-praise, and were Montaigne's maxim observed, that one should say as frankly, *I have sense, I have learning, I have courage, beauty or wit*, as it is sure we often think so, were this the case, I say, every one is sensible, that such a flood of impertinence would break in upon us, as would render society wholly intolerable. For this reason custom has established it as a rule, in common societies, that men should not indulge themselves in self-praise, or even speak much of themselves, and it is only among intimate friends, or people of very manly behaviour, that one is allowed to do himself justice. Nobody finds fault with Maurice, Prince of Orange, for his reply to one, who asked him, whom he esteemed the first general of the age. *The Marquis of Spinola*, said he, *is the second*. Though it is observable, that the self-praise implied is here better implied, than if it had been directly expressed, without any cover or disguise.

He must be a very superficial thinker, who imagines, that all instances of mutual deference are to be understood in earnest and that a man would be more estimable for being ignorant of his own merits and accomplishments. A small bias towards modesty, even in the internal sentiment, is favourably regarded, especially in young people, and a strong bias is required, in the outward behaviour but this excludes not a noble pride and spirit, which may openly display itself in its full extent, when one lies under calumny or oppression of any kind. The generous contumacy of Socrates, as Cicero calls it, has been highly celebrated in all ages, and when joined to the usual modesty of his behaviour, forms a shining character. Iphicrates, the Athenian, being accused of betraying the interests of his country, asked his accuser, *Would you*, says he, *have on a like occasion, been guilty of that crime? By no means*, replied the other. *And can you then imagine*, cried the hero, *that Iphicrates would be guilty?* [Quinctil. lib. v. cap. 12] In short, a generous spirit and self-value, well founded, decently disguised, and courageously supported, under distress and calumny, is a great excellency, and seems to derive its merit from the noble elevation of its sentiment, or its immediate

agreeableness to its possessor. In ordinary characters we approve of a bias towards modesty, which is a quality immediately agreeable to others: the vicious excess of the former virtue, namely, insolence or haughtiness, is immediately disagreeable to others. the excess of the latter is so to the possessor. Thus are the boundaries of these duties adjusted.

A desire of fame, reputation, or a character with others, is so far from being blameable, that it seems inseparable from virtue, genius, capacity, and a generous or noble disposition An attention even to trivial matters, in order to please, is also expected and demanded by society; and no one is surprised, if he find a man in company, to observe a greater elegance of dress and more pleasant flow of conversation, than when he passes his time at home, and with his own family Wherein, then, consists VANITY, which is so justly regarded as a fault or imperfection? It seems to consist chiefly in such an intemperate display of our advantages, honours, and accomplishments; in such an importunate and open demand of praise and admiration, as is offensive to others, and encroaches too far on *their* secret vanity and ambition It is besides a sure symptom of the want of true dignity and elevation of mind, which is so great an ornament in any character For why that impatient desire of applause, as if you were not justly entitled to it, and might not reasonably expect, that it would for ever attend you? Why so anxious to inform us of the great company which you have kept, the obliging things which were said to you, the honours, the distinctions which you met with, as if these were not things of course, and what we could readily, of ourselves, have imagined, without being told of them?

DECENCY, or a proper regard to age, sex, character, and station, in the world, may be ranked among the qualities which are immediately agreeable to others, and which, by that means, acquire praise and approbation. An effeminate behaviour in a man, a rough manner in a woman, these are ugly, because unsuitable to each character, and different from the qualities which we expect in the sexes It is as if a tragedy abounded in comic beauties, or a comedy in tragic. The disproportions hurt the eye, and convey a disagreeable sentiment to the spectators, the source of blame and disapprobation This is that *indecorum* which is explained at large by Cicero in his offices.

Among the other virtues we may also give CLEANLINESS a place; since it naturally renders us agreeable to others, and is no inconsiderable source of love and affection No one will deny, that the negligence in this particular is a fault, and as faults are nothing but smaller vices, and this fault can have no other origin than the uneasy sensation which it excites in others, we may, in this instance, seemingly so trivial, clearly discover the origin of moral distinctions, about

which the learned have involved themselves in such mazes of perplexity and error.

But besides all the *agreeable* qualities, the origin of whose beauty we can in some degree explain and account for, there still remains something mysterious and inexplicable, which conveys an immediate satisfaction to the spectator, but how, or why, or for what reason, he cannot pretend to determine There is a *Manner*, a grace, an ease, a gentleness, an I-know-not-what, which some men possess above others, which is very different from external beauty and comeliness, and which, however, catches our affection almost as suddenly and powerfully And though this *manner* be chiefly talked of in the passion between the sexes, where the concealed magic is easily explained, yet surely much of it prevails in all our estimation of characters, and forms no inconsiderable part of personal merit This class of accomplishments, therefore, must be trusted entirely to the blind, but sure testimony of taste and sentiment, and must be considered as a part of ethics, left by nature to baffle all the pride of philosophy, and make her sensible of her narrow boundaries and slender acquisitions

We approve of another because of his wit, politeness, modesty, or any agreeable quality which he possesses, although he be not of our acquaintance, nor has ever given us any entertainment by means of these accomplishments The idea which we form of their effect on his acquaintance has an agreeable influence on our imagination, and gives the sentiment of approbation This principle enters into all the judgments which we form concerning manners and characters.

SECTION IX.—CONCLUSION.

PART I.—It may justly appear surprising, that any man, in so late an age, should find it requisite to prove, by elaborate reasoning, that PERSONAL MERIT consists altogether in the possession of mental qualities, *useful or agreeable* to the *person himself*, or to *others* It might be expected that this principle would have occurred even to the first rude unpractised inquirers concerning morals, and been received from its own evidence, without any argument or disputation Whatever is valuable in any kind, so naturally classes itself under the division of *useful or agreeable*, the *utile* or the *dulce*, that it is not easy to imagine why we should ever seek farther, or consider the question as a matter of nice research or inquiry And as every thing useful or agreeable must possess these qualities with regard either to the *person himself*, or to *others*, the complete delineation or description of merit seems to be performed as naturally as a shadow is cast by the sun, or an image is reflected upon water. If the ground on which the

shadow is cast be not broken and uneven, nor the surface from which the image is reflected disturbed and confused, a just figure is immediately presented without any art or attention And it seems a reasonable presumption, that systems and hypotheses have perverted our natural understanding, when a theory, so simple and obvious, could so long have escaped the most elaborate examination.

But however the case may have fared with philosophy, in common life these principles are still implicitly maintained nor is any other topic of praise or blame ever recurred to, when we employ any panegyric or satire, any applause or censure of human action and behaviour If we observe men, in every intercourse of business or pleasure, in every discourse and conversation we shall find them no where, except in the schools, at any loss upon this subject What so natural, for instance, as the following dialogue? You are very happy, we shall suppose one to say, addressing himself to another, that you have given your daughter to CLEANTHES. He is a man of honour and humanity Every one who has any intercourse with him is sure of *fair* and *kind* treatment * I congratulate you, too, says another, on the promising expectations of this son-in-law, whose assiduous application to the study of laws, whose quick penetration and early knowledge, both of men and business, prognosticate the greatest honours and advancement † You surprise me, replies a third, when you talk of CLEANTHES as a man of business and application I met him lately in a circle of the gayest company, and he was the very life and soul of our conversation so much wit with good manners, so much gallantry without affectation; so much ingenious knowledge so genteelly delivered, I have never before observed in any one.‡ You would admire him still more, says a fourth, if you knew him more familiarly That cheerfulness which you might remark in him, is not a sudden flash struck out by company it runs through the whole tenor of his life, and preserves a perpetual serenity on his countenance, and tranquillity in his soul. He has met with severe trials, misfortunes as well as dangers and by his greatness of mind, was still superior to them § The image, gentlemen, which you have here delineated CLEANTHES, cried I, is that of accomplished merit. Each of you has given a stroke of the pencil to his figure, and you have unawares exceeded all the pictures drawn by GRATIAN or CASTIGLIONE. A philosopher might select this character as a model of perfect virtue.

And as every quality, which is useful or agreeable to ourselves or others, is, in common life, allowed to be a part of personal merit; so no other will ever be received, where men judge of things by their

* Qualities useful to others. † Qualities useful to the person himself.
‡ Qualities immediately agreeable to others
§ Qualities immediately agreeable to the person himself.

natural, unprejudiced reason, without the delusive glosses of superstition and false religion. Celibacy, fasting, penance, mortification, self-denial, humility, silence, solitude, and the whole train of monkish virtues; for what reason are they every where rejected by men of sense, but because they serve to no manner of purpose; neither advance a man's fortune in the world, nor render him a more valuable member of society; neither qualify him for the entertainment of company, nor increase his power of self-enjoyment? We observe, on the contrary, that they cross all these desirable ends; stupify the understanding and harden the heart, obscure the fancy and sour the temper. We justly, therefore, transfer them to the opposite column, and place them in the catalogue of vices; nor has any superstition force sufficient among men of the world, to pervert entirely these natural sentiments. A gloomy, hair-brained enthusiast, after his death, may have a place in the calendar; but will scarcely ever be admitted when alive, into intimacy and society, except by those who are as delirious and dismal as himself.

It seems a happiness in the present theory, that it enters not into that vulgar dispute concerning the *degrees* of benevolence or self-love, which prevail in human nature; a dispute which is never likely to have any issue; both because men, who have taken part, are not easily convinced, and because the phenomena, which can be produced on either side, are so dispersed, so uncertain, and subject to so many interpretations, that it is scarcely possible accurately to compare them, or draw from them any determinate inference or conclusion. It is sufficient for our present purpose, if it be allowed, what surely, without the greatest absurdity, cannot be disputed, that there is some benevolence, however small, infused into our bosom; some spark of friendship for human kind; some particle of the dove, kneaded into our frame, along with the elements of the wolf and serpent. Let these generous sentiments be supposed ever so weak; let them be insufficient to move even a hand or finger of our body; they must still direct the determinations of our mind; and where every thing else is equal, produce a cool preference of what is useful and serviceable to mankind above what is pernicious and dangerous. A *moral-distinction*, therefore, immediately arises; a general sentiment of blame and approbation; a tendency, however faint, to the objects of the one, and a proportionable aversion to those of the other. Nor will those reasoners, who so earnestly maintain the predominant selfishness of human kind, be any wise scandalized at hearing of the weak sentiments of virtue implanted in our nature. On the contrary, they are found as ready to maintain the one tenet as the other; and their spirit of satire (for such it appears, rather than of corruption) naturally gives rise to both opinions; which have, indeed, a great and almost indissoluble connection together.

Avarice, ambition, vanity, and all passions vulgarly, though improperly, comprised under the denomination of *self-love*, are here excluded from our theory concerning the origin of morals, not because they are too weak, but because they have not a proper direction for that purpose. The notion of morals implies some sentiment common to all mankind, which recommends the same object to general approbation, and makes every man, or most men, agree in the same opinion or decision concerning it. It also implies some sentiment, so universal and comprehensive, as to extend to all mankind, and render the actions and conduct, even of the persons the most remote, an object of applause or censure, according as they agree or disagree with that rule of right which is established. These two requisite circumstances belong alone to the sentiment of humanity here insisted on. The other passions produce, in every breast, many strong sentiments of desire and aversion, affection and hatred; but these neither are felt so much in common, nor are so comprehensive, as to be the foundation of any general system and established theory of blame or approbation.

When a man denominates another his *enemy*, his *rival*, his *antagonist*, his *adversary*, he is understood to speak the language of self-love, and to express sentiments peculiar to himself, and arising from his particular circumstances and situation. But when he bestows on any man the epithets of *vicious*, or *odious*, or *depraved*, he then speaks another language, and expresses sentiments, in which he expects all his audience are to concur with him. He must here, therefore, depart from his private and particular situations, and must choose a point of view, common to him with others; he must move some universal principle of the human frame, and touch a string, to which all mankind have an accord and sympathy. If he mean, therefore, to express, that this man possesses qualities, whose tendency is pernicious to society, he has chosen this common point of view, and has touched the principle of humanity, in which every man, in some degree, concurs. While the human heart is compounded of the same elements as at present, it will never be wholly indifferent to public good, nor entirely unaffected with the tendency of characters and manners. And though this affection of humanity may not generally be esteemed so strong as vanity or ambition, yet, being common to all men, it can alone be the foundation of morals, or of any general system of blame or praise. One man's ambition is not another's ambition; nor will the same event or object satisfy both: but the humanity of one man is the humanity of every one; and the same object touches this passion in all human creatures.

But the sentiments, which arise from humanity, are not only the same in all human creatures, and produce the same approbation or censure; but they also comprehend all human creatures; nor is there any one whose conduct or character is not, by [illegible]

to every one, of censure or approbation. On the contrary, those other passions, commonly denominated selfish, both produce different sentiments in each individual, according to his particular situation, and also contemplate the greater part of mankind with the utmost indifference and unconcern. Whoever has a high regard and esteem for me flatters my vanity, whoever expresses contempt mortifies and displeases me. but as my name is not known but to a small part of mankind, there are few, who come within the sphere of this passion, or excite, on its account, either my affection or disgust. But if you represent a tyrannical, insolent, or barbarous behaviour, in any country or in any age of the world, I soon carry my eye to the pernicious tendency of such a conduct, and feel the sentiment of repugnance and displeasure towards it. No character can be so remote as to be, in this light, wholly indifferent to me. What is beneficial to society or to the person himself, must still be preferred. And every quality or action, of every human being, must, by this means, be ranked under some class or denomination, expressive of general censure or applause.

What more, therefore, can we ask to distinguish the sentiments, dependent on humanity, from those connected with any other passion, or to satisfy us, why the former are the origin of morals, not the latter? Whatever conduct gains my approbation, by touching my humanity, procures also the applause of all mankind, by affecting the same principle in them. but what serves my avarice or ambition pleases these passions in me alone, and affects not the avarice and ambition of the rest of mankind. There is no circumstance of conduct in any man, provided it have a beneficial tendency, that is not agreeable to my humanity, however remote the person. but every man, so far removed as neither to cross nor serve my avarice and ambition, is regarded as wholly indifferent by those passions. The distinction, therefore, between these species of sentiment, being so great and evident, language must soon be moulded upon it, and must invent a peculiar set of terms, in order to express those universal sentiments of censure or approbation, which arise from humanity, or from views of general usefulness and its contrary. VIRTUE and VICE become then known. morals are recognized: certain general ideas are framed of human conduct and behaviour. such measures are expected from men, in such situations. this action is determined to be conformable to our abstract rule, that other, contrary. And by such universal principles are the particular sentiments of self-love frequently controlled and limited.*

* It seems certain, both from reason and experience, that a rude untaught savage [illegible] chiefly his love and hatred by the ideas of private utility and injury, and has but [illegible] conceptions of a general rule or system of behaviour. The man who stands [illegible] in battle, he hates heartily, not only for the present moment, which is almost [illegible] for ever after; nor is he satisfied without the most extreme punishment and vengeance.

From instances of popular tumults, seditions, factions, panics, and of all passions, which are shared with a multitude, we may learn the influence of society, in exciting and supporting any emotion; while the most ungovernable disorders are raised, we find, by that means, from the slightest and most frivolous occasion. Solon was no very cruel, though, perhaps, an unjust legislator, who punished neuters in civil wars; and few, I believe, would, in such cases, incur the penalty, were there *affection and discourse allowed sufficient to absolve them.* No selfishness, and scarce any philosophy, have there force sufficient to support a total coolness and indifference; and he must be more or less than man, who kindles not in the common blaze. What wonder, then, that moral sentiments are found of such influence in life; though springing from principles, which may appear, at first sight, somewhat small and delicate? But these principles, we must remark, are social and universal: they form, in a manner, the *party* of human-kind against vice or disorder, its common enemy: and as the benevolent concern for others is diffused, in a greater or less degree over all men, and is the same in all, it occurs more frequently in discourse, is cherished by society and conversation; and the blame and approbation, consequent on it, are thereby roused from that lethargy, into which they are probably lulled, in solitary and uncultivated nature. Other passions, though perhaps originally stronger, yet being selfish and private, are often overpowered by its force and yield the dominion of our breast to those social and public principles.

Another spring of our constitution, that brings a great addition of force to moral sentiment, is the love of fame; which rules, with such uncontrolled authority, in all generous minds, and is often the grand object of all their designs and undertakings. By our continual and earnest pursuit of a character, a name, a reputation in the world, we bring our own deportment and conduct frequently in review, and consider how they appear in the eyes of those who approach and regard us. This constant habit of surveying ourselves, as it were, in reflection, keeps alive all the sentiments of right and wrong, and begets, in noble natures, a certain reverence for themselves as well as others; which is the surest guardian of every virtue. The animal conveniences and pleasures sink gradually in their value; while every inward beauty and moral grace is studiously acquired, and the mind is accom-

we, accustomed to society, and to more enlarged reflections, consider that this man is serving his own country and community; that any man, in the same situation, would do the same; that we ourselves, in like circumstances, observe a like conduct; that, in general, human society is best supported on such maxims. And by these suppositions and views, we correct, in some measure, our ruder and narrower passions. And though much of our friendship and enmity be still regulated by private considerations of benefit and harm, we pay at least this homage to general rules, which we are accustomed to respect, that we commonly pervert our adversary's conduct, by imputing malice or injustice to him, in order to give vent to those passions which arise from self love and private interest. When the heart is full of rage, it never wants pretences of this nature; though sometimes as frivolous, as those from which Horace, being almost crushed by the fall of a tree, affects to accuse of parricide the first planter of it.

plished in every perfection, who can adorn or embellish a rational character.

Here is the most perfect morality with which we are acquainted here is displayed the force of many sympathies Our moral sentiment is itself a feeling chiefly of that nature and our regard to a character with others seems to arise only from a care of preserving a character with ourselves, and in order to attain this end, we find it necessary to prop our tottering judgment on the correspondent approbation of mankind

But, that we may accommodate matters, and remove, if possible, every difficulty let us allow all these reasonings to be false Let us allow, that, when we resolve the pleasure, which arises from views of utility into the sentiments of humanity and sympathy, we have embraced a wrong hypothesis Let us confess it necessary to find some other explication of that applause, which is paid to objects, whether inanimate, animate, or rational, if they have a tendency to promote the welfare and advantage of mankind However difficult it be to conceive, that an object is approved of on account of its tendency to a certain end, while the end itself is totally indifferent, let us swallow this absurdity, and consider what are the consequences The preceding delineation or definition of PERSONAL MERIT must still retain its evidence and authority it must still be allowed, that every quality of the mind, which is *useful* or *agreeable* to the *person himself* or to *others*, communicates a pleasure to the spectator engages his esteem, and is admitted under the honourable denomination of virtue or merit. Are not justice, fidelity, honour, veracity, allegiance, chastity, esteemed solely on account of their tendency to promote the good of society? Is not that tendency inseparable from humanity, benevolence, lenity, generosity, gratitude, moderation, tenderness, friendship, and all the other social virtues? Can it possibly be doubted, that industry, discretion, frugality, secrecy, order, perseverance forethought, judgment, and this whole class of virtues and accomplishments, of which many pages would not contain the catalogue, can it be doubted, I say, that the tendency of these qualities to promote the interest and happiness of their possessor, is the sole foundation of their merit? Who can dispute that a mind, which supports a perpetual serenity and cheerfulness, a noble dignity and undaunted spirit, a tender affection and good-will to all around, as it has more enjoyment within itself, is also a more animating and rejoicing spectacle, than if dejected with melancholy, tormented with anxiety, irritated with rage, or sunk into the most abject baseness and degeneracy? And as to the qualities immediately *agreeable to others*, they speak sufficiently for themselves; and he must be unhappy indeed, either in his own temper, or in his situation and company, who has never perceived the charms of a

facetious wit or flowing affability, of a delicate modesty or decent genteelness of address and manner

I am sensible that nothing can be more unphilosophical than to be positive or dogmatical on any subject, and that, even if *excessive* scepticism could be maintained, it would not be more destructive to all just reasoning and inquiry I am convinced, that, where men are the most sure and arrogant, they are commonly the most mistaken, and have there given reins to passion, without that proper deliberation and suspense, which can alone secure them from the grossest absurdities Yet, I must confess, that this enumeration puts the matter in so strong a light, that I cannot, *at present*, be more assured of any truth, which I learn from reasoning and argument, than that personal merit consists entirely in the usefulness and agreeableness of qualities to the person himself possessed of them, or to others, who have any intercourse with him But when I reflect, that though the bulk and figure of the earth have been measured and delineated, though the motions of the tides have been accounted for, the order and economy of the heavenly bodies subjected to their proper laws, and INFINITE itself reduced to calculation, yet men still dispute concerning the foundation of their moral duties when I reflect on this, I say, I fall back into diffidence and scepticism, and suspect, that an hypothesis, so obvious, had it been a true one, would, long ere now, have been received by the unanimous suffrage and consent of mankind.

PART II – Having explained the moral *approbation* attending merit or virtue, there remains nothing, but briefly to consider our interested *obligation* to it, and to inquire, whether every man, who has any regard to his own happiness and welfare, will not best find his account in the practice of every moral duty If this can be clearly ascertained from the foregoing theory, we shall have the satisfaction to reflect, that we have advanced principles, which not only, it is hoped, will stand the test of reasoning and inquiry, but may contribute to the amendment of men's lives, and their improvement in morality and social virtue And though the philosophical truth of any proposition by no means depends on its tendency to promote the interests of society, yet a man has but a bad grace, who delivers a theory, however true, which, he must confess leads to a practice dangerous and pernicious. Why rake into those corners of nature, which spread a nuisance all around? Why dig up the pestilence from the pit in which it is buried? The ingenuity of your researches may be admired; but your systems will be detested, and mankind will agree, if they cannot refute them, to sink them at least, in eternal silence and oblivion. Truths, which are *pernicious* to society, if any such there be, will yield to errors, which are salutary and *advantageous*.

But what philosophical truths can be more advantageous to society than those here delivered, which represent virtue in all her genuine and most engaging charms, and make us approach her with ease, familiarity, and affection? The dismal dress falls off, with which many divines, and some philosophers, have covered her? and nothing appears but gentleness, humanity, beneficence, affability, nay, even at proper intervals, play, frolic, and gaiety. She talks not of useless austerities and rigours, suffering and self-denial. She declares, that her sole purpose is, to make her votaries, and all mankind, during every instant of their existence, if possible, cheerful and happy, nor does she ever willingly part with any pleasure but in hopes of ample compensation in some other period of their lives. The sole trouble, which she demands, is that of just calculation, and a steady preference of the greater happiness. And if any austere pretenders approach her, enemies to joy and pleasure, she either rejects them as hypocrites and deceivers, or, if she admit them in her train, they are ranked, however, among the least favoured of her votaries.

And, indeed, to drop all figurative expression, what hopes can we ever have of engaging mankind to a practice, which we confess full of austerity and rigour? Or what theory of morals can ever serve any useful purpose, unless it can show, by a particular detail, that all the duties which it recommends are also the true interest of each individual? The peculiar advantage of the foregoing system seems to be, that it furnishes proper mediums for that purpose.

That the virtues which are immediately *useful* or *agreeable*, to the person possessed of them, are desirable in a view to self-interest, it would surely be superfluous to prove. Moralists, indeed, may spare themselves all the pains which they often take in recommending these duties. To what purpose collect arguments to evince, that temperance is advantageous, and the excesses of pleasure hurtful? When it appears that these excesses are only denominated such because they are hurtful, and that, if the unlimited use of strong liquors, for instance, no more impaired health, or the faculties of mind and body, than the use of air or water, it would not be a whit more vicious or blameable.

It seems equally superfluous to prove, that the *companionable* virtues of good manners and wit, decency and genteelness, are more desirable than the contrary qualities. Vanity alone, without any other consideration, is a sufficient motive to make us wish for the possession of these accomplishments. No man was ever willingly deficient in this particular. All our failures here proceed from bad education, want of capacity, or a perverse and unpliable disposition. Would you have your company coveted, admired, followed; rather than hated, despised, avoided? Can any one seriously deliberate in the case? As no enjoyment is sincere, without some reference to company and

society, so no society can be agreeable, or even tolerable, where a man feels his presence unwelcome, and discovers all around him symptoms of disgust and aversion.

But why, in the great society or confederacy of mankind, should not the case be the same as in particular clubs and companies? Why is it more doubtful, that the enlarged virtues of humanity, generosity, beneficence, are desirable, with a view to happiness and self-interest, than the limited endowments of ingenuity and politeness? Are we apprehensive lest those social affections interfere, in a greater or more immediate degree, than any other pursuits, with private utility, and cannot be gratified, without some important sacrifice of honour and advantage? If so, we are but ill instructed in the nature of the human passions, and are more influenced by verbal distinctions than by real differences

Whatever contradiction may vulgarly be supposed between the *selfish* and *social* sentiments or dispositions, they are really no more opposite than selfish and ambitious, selfish and revengeful, selfish and vain. It is requisite, that there be an original propensity of some kind, in order to be a basis to self-love, by giving a relish to the objects of its pursuit, and none more fit for this purpose than benevolence or humanity The goods of fortune are spent in one gratification or another the miser, who accumulates his annual income, and lends it out at interest, has really spent it in the gratification of his avarice. And it would be difficult to show, why a man is more a loser by a generous action, than by any other method of expense, since the utmost which he can attain, by the most elaborate selfishness, is the indulgence of some affection

Now if life, without passion, must be altogether insipid and tiresome, let a man suppose that he has full power of modelling his own disposition, and let him deliberate what appetite or desire he would chuse for the foundation of his happiness and enjoyment. Every affection, he would observe, when gratified by success, gives a satisfaction proportioned to its force and violence but besides this advantage, common to all, the immediate feeling of benevolence and friendship, humanity and kindness, is sweet, smooth, tender, and agreeable, independent of all fortune and accidents These virtues are besides attended with a pleasing consciousness or remembrance, and keep us in humour with ourselves as well as others; while we retain the agreeable reflection of having done our part towards mankind and society. And though all men show a jealousy of our success in the pursuits of avarice and ambition; yet are we almost sure of their good-will and good-wishes, so long as we persevere in the paths of virtue, and employ ourselves in the execution of generous plans and purposes. What other passion is there where we shall find so many advantages united; an agreeable sentiment, a pleasing consciousness,

a good reputation? But of these truths, we may observe, men are, of themselves, pretty much convinced, nor are they deficient in their duty to society, because they would not wish to be generous, friendly, and humane, but because they do not feel themselves such.

Treating vice with the greatest candour, and making it all possible concessions, we must acknowledge, that there is not, in any instance, the smallest pretext for giving it the preference above virtue, with a view to self-interest, except, perhaps, in the case of justice, where a man, taking things in a certain light, may often seem to be a loser by his integrity. And though it is allowed, that, without a regard to property, no society could subsist, yet, according to the imperfect way in which human affairs are conducted, a sensible knave, in particular incidents, may think, that an act of iniquity or infidelity will make a considerable addition to his fortune, without causing any considerable breach in the social union and confederacy. That *honesty is the best policy*, may be a good general rule, but it is liable to many exceptions. And he, it may, perhaps, be thought, conducts himself with most wisdom, who observes the general rule, and takes advantage of all the exceptions.

I must confess, that if a man think that this reasoning much requires an answer, it will be a little difficult to find any, which will to him appear satisfactory and convincing. If his heart rebel not against such pernicious maxims, if he feel no reluctance to the thoughts of villainy or baseness, he has indeed lost a considerable motive to virtue, and we may expect, that his practice will be answerable to his speculation. But in all ingenuous natures, the antipathy to treachery and roguery is too strong to be counterbalanced by any views of profit or pecuniary advantage. Inward peace of mind, consciousness of integrity, a satisfactory review of our own conduct, these are circumstances very requisite to happiness, and will be cherished and cultivated by every honest man, who feels the importance of them.

Such a one has, besides, the frequent satisfaction of seeing knaves, with all their pretended cunning and abilities, betrayed by their own maxims, and while they purpose to cheat with moderation and secrecy, a tempting incident occurs, nature is frail, and they give into the snare, whence they can never extricate themselves, without a total loss of reputation, and the forfeiture of all future trust and confidence with mankind.

But were they ever so secret and successful, the honest man, if he has any tincture of philosophy, or even common observation and reflection, will discover that they themselves are, in the end, the greatest dupes, and have sacrificed the invaluable enjoyment of a character, with themselves at least, for the acquisition of worthless toys and gewgaws. How little is requisite to supply the *necessities* of nature? And in a view to *pleasure*, what comparison between the unbought

satisfaction of conversation, society, study, even health and the common beauties of nature, and above all the peaceful reflection on one's own conduct. what comparison, I say, between these, and the feverish, empty amusements of luxury and expense? These natural pleasures, indeed, are really without price, both because they are below all price in their attainment, and above it in their enjoyment.

APPENDIX I—CONCERNING MORAL SENTIMENT.

If the foregoing hypothesis be received, it will now be easy for us to determine the question first started, [Sect 1] concerning the general principles of morals and though we postponed the decision of that question, lest it should then involve us in intricate speculations, which are unfit for moral discourses, we may resume it at present, and examine how far either *reason* or *sentiment* enters into all decisions of praise or censure.

One principal foundation of moral praise being supposed to lie in the usefulness of any quality or action, it is evident that *reason* must enter for a considerable share in all decisions of this kind, since nothing but that faculty can instruct us in the tendency of qualities and actions, and point out their beneficial consequences to society and to their possessors In many cases, this is an affair liable to great controversy doubts may arise, opposite interests may occur, and a preference must be given to one side, from very nice views, and a small overbalance of utility This is particularly remarkable in questions with regard to justice, as, is, indeed, natural to suppose, from that species of utility which attends this virtue [Appendix III] Were every single instance of justice, like that of benevolence, useful to society, this would be a more simple state of the case, and seldom liable to great controversy But as single instances of justice are often pernicious in their first and immediate tendency, and as the advantage to society results only from the observance of the general rule, and from the concurrence and combination of several persons in the same equitable conduct; the case here becomes more intricate and involved. The various circumstances of society, the various consequences of any practice; the various interests which may be proposed these, on many occasions, are doubtful, and subject to great discussion and inquiry. The object of municipal laws is to fix all the questions with regard to justice, the debates of civilians, the reflections of politicians, the precedents of history and public records, are all directed to the same purpose. And a very accurate *reason* or *judgment* is often requisite

to give the true determination, amidst such intricate doubts arising from obscure or opposite utilities

But though reason, when fully assisted and improved, be sufficient to instruct us in the pernicious or useful tendency of qualities and actions, it is not alone sufficient to produce any moral blame or approbation. Utility is only a tendency to a certain end, and were the end totally indifferent to us, we should feel the same indifference towards the means It is requisite a *sentiment* should here display itself, in order to give a preference to the useful above the pernicious tendencies This sentiment can be no other than a feeling for the happiness of mankind, and a resentment of their misery, since these are the different ends which virtue and vice have a tendency to promote Here, therefore, *reason* instructs us in the several tendencies of actions, and *humanity* makes a distinction in favour of such as are useful and beneficial.

This partition between the faculties of understanding and sentiment, in all moral decisions, seems clear from the preceding hypothesis but I shall suppose that hypothesis false It will then be requisite to look out for some other theory, that may be satisfactory, and I dare venture to affirm, that none such will ever be found, so long as we suppose reason to be the sole source of morals To prove this, it will be proper to weigh the five following considerations

I. It is easy for a false hypothesis to maintain some appearance of truth, while it keeps wholly in generals, makes use of undefined terms, and employs comparisons instead of instances This is particularly remarkable in that philosophy which ascribes the discernment of all moral distinctions to reason alone, without the concurrence of sentiment. It is impossible that, in any particular instance, this hypothesis can so much as be rendered intelligible, whatever specious figure it may make in general declamations and discourses Examine the crime of *ingratitude*, for instance, which has place wherever we observe good-will, expressed and known, together with good offices performed, on the one side, and a return of ill-will or indifference, with ill offices or neglect on the other anatomise all these circumstances, and examine, by your reason alone, in what consists the demerit or blame you never will come to any issue or conclusion

Reason judges either of *matter of fact* or of *relations* Inquire, then, *first*, where is that matter of fact which we here call *crime*; point it out, determine the time of its existence, describe its essence or nature; explain the sense or faculty to which it discovers itself. It resides in the mind of the person who is ungrateful. He must, therefore, feel it, and be conscious of it But nothing is there, except the passion of ill-will or absolute indifference. You cannot say, that these of themselves always, and in all circumstances, are crimes. No: they are only crimes when directed towards persons who have before expressed and displayed good-will towards us. Consequently, we may

infer that the crime of ingratitude is not any particular individual *fact*, but arises from a complication of circumstances, which, being presented to the spectator, excites the *sentiment* of blame, by the particular structure and fabric of his mind.

This representation, you say, is false. Crime, indeed, consists not in a particular *fact*, of whose reality we are assured by *reason*; but it consists in certain *moral relations* discovered by reason, in the same manner as we discover, by reason, the truths of geometry or algebra. But what are the relations, I ask, of which you here talk? In the case stated above, I see first good-will and good-offices in one person; then ill-will and ill-offices in the other. Between these, there is the relation of *contrariety*. Does the crime consist in that relation? But suppose a person bore me ill-will or did me ill-offices; and I, in return, were indifferent towards him, or did him good offices. here is the same relation of *contrariety*; and yet my conduct is often highly laudable. Twist and turn this matter as much as you will, you can never rest the morality on relation, but must have recourse to the decisions of sentiment.

When it is affirmed, that two and three are equal to the half of ten; this relation of equality I understand perfectly. I conceive, that if ten be divided into two parts, of which the one has as many units as the other; and if any of these parts be compared to two added to three, it will contain as many units as that compound number. But when you draw thence a comparison to moral relations, I own that I am altogether at a loss to understand you. A moral action, a crime, such as ingratitude, is a complicated object. Does the morality consist in the relation of its parts to each other? How? After what manner? Specify the relation: be more particular and explicit in your propositions; and you will easily see their falsehood.

No, say you, the morality consists in the relation of actions to the rule of right; and they are denominated good or ill, according as they agree or disagree with it. What then is the rule of right? In what does it consist? How is it determined? By reason, you say, which examines the moral relations of actions. So that moral relations are determined by the comparison of actions to a rule. And that rule is determined by considering the moral relations of objects. Is not this fine reasoning?

All this is metaphysics, you cry. That is enough: there needs nothing more to give a strong presumption of falsehood. Yes, reply I: here are metaphysics, surely: but they are all on your side, who advance an abstruse hypothesis, which can never be made intelligible, nor quadrate with any particular instance or illustration. The hypothesis which we embrace is plain. It maintains, that morality is determined by sentiment. It defines virtue to be *whatever mental action or quality gives to a spectator the pleasing sentiment of ap-*

probation; and vice the contrary We then proceed to examine a plain matter of fact, to wit, what actions have this influence we consider all the circumstances, in which these actions agree, and thence endeavour to extract some general observations with regard to these sentiments If you call this metaphysics, and find any thing abstruse here, you need only conclude, that your turn of mind is not suited to the moral sciences.

II When a man, at any time, deliberates concerning his own conduct, (as, whether he had better, in a particular emergence, assist a brother or a benefactor), he must consider these separate relations, with all the circumstances and situations of the persons, in order to determine the superior duty and obligation and in order to determine the proportion of lines in any triangle, it is necessary to examine the nature of that figure, and the relations which its several parts bear to each other But notwithstanding this appearing similarity in the two cases, there is at bottom, an extreme difference between them A speculative reasoner concerning triangles or circles, considers the several known and given relations of the parts of these figures, and thence infers some unknown relation, which is dependent on the former But in moral deliberations we must be acquainted, beforehand, with all the objects, and all their relations to each other and from a comparison of the whole, fix our choice or approbation No new fact to be ascertained no new relation to be discovered, All the circumstances of the case are supposed to be laid before us, ere we can fix any sentence of blame or approbation If any material circumstance be yet unknown or doubtful, we must first employ our inquiry or intellectual faculties to assure us of it, and must suspend for a time all moral decision or sentiment While we are ignorant, whether a man were aggressor or not, how can we determine whether the person who killed him, be criminal or innocent? But after every circumstance, every relation is known, the understanding has no farther room to operate, nor any object on which it could employ itself The approbation or blame, which then ensues, cannot be the work of the judgment, but of the heart, and is not a speculative proposition or affirmation, but an active feeling or sentiment In the disquisitions of the understanding, from known circumstances and relations we infer some new and unknown. In moral decisions, all the circumstances and relations must be previously known, and the mind, from the contemplation of the whole, feels some new impression of affection or disgust, esteem or contempt, approbation or blame

Hence the great difference between a mistake of *fact* and one of *right;* and hence the reason why the one is commonly criminal and not the other. When Œdipus killed Laius, he was ignorant of the relation, and from circumstances, innocent and involuntary, formed erroneous opinions concerning the action which he committed. But

when Nero killed Agrippina, all the relations between himself and the person, and all the circumstances of the fact, were previously known to him: but the motive of revenge, or fear, or interest, prevailed in his savage heart over the sentiments of duty and humanity. And when we express that detestation against him, to which he, himself, in a little time, became insensible, it is not, that we see any relations, of which he was ignorant, but that, from the rectitude of our disposition, we feel sentiments, against which he was hardened from flattery and a long perseverance in the most enormous crimes. In these sentiments, then, not in a discovery of relations of any kind, do all moral determinations consist. Before we can pretend to form any decision of this kind, every thing must be known and ascertained on the side of the object or action. Nothing remains but to feel, on our part, some sentiment of blame or approbation, whence we pronounce the action criminal or virtuous.

III. This doctrine will become still more evident, if we compare moral beauty with natural, to which, in many particulars, it bears so near a resemblance. It is on the proportion, relation, and position of parts, that all natural beauty depends: but it would be absurd thence to infer, that the perception of beauty, like that of truth in geometrical problems, consists wholly in the perception of relations, and was performed entirely by the understanding or intellectual faculties. In all the sciences, our mind, from the known relations, investigates the unknown: but in all decisions of taste or external beauty, all the relations are before-hand obvious to the eye; and we thence proceed to feel the sentiment of complacency or disgust, according to the object, and disposition of our organs.

Euclid has fully explained all the qualities of the circle, but has not in any proposition, said a word of its beauty. The reason is evident. The beauty is not a quality of the circle. It lies not in any part of the line, whose parts are equally distant from a common centre. It is only the effect, which that figure produces upon the mind, whose peculiar fabric or structure renders it susceptible of such sentiments. In vain would you look for it in the circle, or seek it, either by your senses or by mathematical reasonings, in all the properties of that figure.

Attend to PALLADIO and PERRAULT, while they explain all the parts and proportions of a pillar: they talk of the cornice and frieze, and base and entablature, and shaft and architrave, and give the description and position of each of these members. But should you ask the description and position of its beauty, they would readily reply, that the beauty is not in any of the parts or members of a pillar, but results from the whole, when that complicated figure is presented to an intelligent mind, susceptible to those finer sensations. Till such a spectator appear, there is nothing but a figure of such particular [illegible] and proportions: from his sentiments alone arise its [illegible]

Again attend to Cicero, while he paints the crimes of a Verres or a Catiline, you must acknowledge that the moral turpitude results, in the same manner, from the contemplation of the whole, when presented to a being whose organs have such a particular structure and formation. The orator may paint rage, insolence, barbarity on the one side meekness, suffering, sorrow, innocence on the other. But if you feel no indignation or compassion arise in you from this complication of circumstances, you would in vain ask him, in what consists the crime or villainy, which he so vehemently exclaims against at what time, or on what subject it first began to exist and what has a few months afterwards become of it, when every disposition and thought of all the actors is totally altered or annihilated No satisfactory answer can be given to any of these questions, upon the abstract hypothesis of morals, and we must at last acknowledge, that the crime or immorality is no particular fact or relation, which can be the object of the understanding, but arises entirely from the sentiment of disapprobation, which, by the structure of human nature, we unavoidably feel on the apprehension of barbarity or treachery

IV. Inanimate objects may bear to each other all the same relations, which we observe in moral agents, though the former can never be the object of love or hatred, nor are consequently susceptible of merit or iniquity A young tree, which over-tops and destroys its parent stands in all the same relations with Nero, when he murdered Agrippina; and if morality consisted merely in relations, would, no doubt, be equally criminal

V It appears evident, that the ultimate ends of human actions can never, in any case, be accounted for by *reason*, but recommend themselves entirely to the sentiments and affections of mankind, without any dependence on the intellectual faculties. Ask a man *why he uses exercise*, he will answer, *because he desires to keep his health*, if you then inquire, *why he desires health*, he will readily reply, *because sickness is painful* If you push your inquiries farther, and desire a This reason, *why he hates pain*, it is impossible he can ever give any is an ultimate end, and is never referred to any other object.

Perhaps, to your second question, *why he desires health*, he may also reply, that *it is necessary for the exercise of his calling.* If you ask, *why he is anxious on that head*, he will answer, *because he desires to get money.* If you demand, *Why? It is the instrument of pleasure*, says he. And beyond this it is an absurdity to ask for a reason. It is impossible there can be a progress *in infinitum*, and that one thing can always be a reason, why another is desired Something must be desirable on its own account, and because of its immediate accord or agreement with human sentiment and affection.

Now as virtue is an end, and is desirable on its own account, without fee or reward, merely for the immediate satisfaction which it

conveys it is requisite that there should be some sentiment which it touches, some internal taste or feeling, or whatever you please to call it, which distinguishes moral good and evil, and which embraces the one and rejects the other

Thus the distinct boundaries and offices of *reason* and of *taste* are easily ascertained. The former conveys the knowledge of truth and falsehood the latter gives the sentiment of beauty and deformity, vice and virtue The one discovers objects, as they really stand in nature, without addition or diminution the other has a productive faculty, and gilding or staining all natural objects with the colours, borrowed from internal sentiment, raises, in a manner, a new creation. Reason, being cool and disengaged, is no motive to action, and directs only the impulse received from appetite or inclination, by showing us the means of attaining happiness or avoiding misery Taste, as it gives pleasure or pain, and thereby constitutes happiness or misery, becomes a motive to action, and is the first spring or impulse to desire and volition From circumstances and relations, known or supposed, the former leads us to the discovery of the concealed and unknown. After all circumstances and relations are laid before us, the latter makes us feel from the whole a new sentiment of blame or approbation The standard of the one, being founded on the nature of things, is eternal and inflexible, even by the will of the Supreme Being the standard of the other, arising from the internal frame and constitution of animals, is ultimately derived from that Supreme Will, which bestowed on each being its peculiar nature, and arranged the several classes and orders of existence.

APPENDIX II.—OF SELF-LOVE.

There is a principle supposed to prevail among many, which is utterly incompatible with all virtue or moral sentiment and as it can proceed from nothing but the most depraved disposition, so in its turn it tends still further to encourage that depravity This principle is, that all *benevolence* is mere hypocrisy, friendship a cheat, public spirit a farce, fidelity a snare to procure trust and confidence, and that, while all of us, at bottom, pursue only our private interest, we wear these fair disguises, in order to put others off their guard, and expose them the more to our wiles and machinations. What heart one must be possessed of who professes such principles, and who feels no internal sentiment that belies so pernicious a theory, it is easy to imagine, and also, what degree of affection and benevolence he can bear to a species, whom he represents under such odious colours, and supposes so little susceptible of gratitude or any return of affection, Or if we should not ascribe these principles wholly to a corrupted heart, we must, at least, account

for them from the most careless and precipitate examination. Superficial reasoners, indeed, observing many false pretences among mankind, and feeling, perhaps, no very strong restraint in their own disposition, might draw a general and a hasty conclusion, that all is equally corrupted, and that men, different from all other animals, and indeed from all other species of existence, admit of no degrees of good or bad, but are, in every instance, the same creatures under different disguises and appearances

There is another principle, somewhat resembling the former, which has been much insisted on by philosophers, and has been the foundation of many a system, that, whatever affection one may feel, or imagine he feels, for others, no passion is, or can be disinterested, that the most generous frindship, however sincere, is a modification of self-love, and that, even unknown to ourselves, we seek only our own gratification, while we appear the most deeply engaged in schemes for the liberty and happiness of mankind. By a turn of imagination, by a refinement of reflection, by an enthusiasm of passion, we seem to take part in the interests of others and imagine ourselves divested of all selfish considerations but, at bottom, the most generous patriot and most niggardly miser, the bravest hero and most abject coward, have, in every action, an equal regard to their own happiness and welfare.

Whoever concludes, from the seeming tendency of this opinion, that those, who make profession of it, cannot possibly feel the true sentiments of benevolence, or have any regard for genuine virtue, will often find himself, in practice, very much mistaken. Probity and honour were no strangers to Epicurus and his sect. Atticus and Horace seem to have enjoyed from nature, and cultivated, by reflection, as generous and friendly dispositions as any disciple of the austerer schools. And among the moderns, Hobbes and Locke, who maintained the selfish system of morals, lived irreproachable lives, though the former lay not under any restraint of religion, which might supply the defects of his philosophy An Epicurean or Hobbist readily allows, that there is such a thing as friendship in the world without hypocrisy or disguise, though he may attempt, by a philosophical chemistry, to resolve the elements of this passion, if I may so speak, into those of another, and explain every affection to be self-love, twisted and moulded, by a particular turn of imagination, into a variety of appearances. But as the same turn of imagination prevails not in every man, nor gives the same direction to the original passion, this is sufficient, even according to the selfish system, to make the widest difference in human characters, and denominate one man virtuous and humane, another vicious and meanly interested. I esteem the man, whose self-love, by whatever means, is so directed as to give him a concern for others, and render him serviceable to society as I hate or des-

pose him, who has no regard to any thing beyond his own gratifications and enjoyments. In vain would you suggest, that these characters, though seemingly opposite, are, at bottom the same, and that a very inconsiderable turn of thought forms the whole difference between them Each character, notwithstanding these inconsiderable differences, appears to me, in practice, pretty durable and untransmutable And I find not in this more than in other subjects, that the natural sentiments, arising from the general appearances of things, are easily destroyed by subtile reflections concerning the minute origin of these appearances. Does not the lively, cheerful colour of a countenance, inspire me with complacency and pleasure, even though I learn from philosophy, that all difference of complexion arises from the most minute differences of thickness, in the most minute parts of the skin, by means of which a superficies is qualified to reflect one of the original colours of light, and absorb the others?

But though the question, concerning the universal or partial selfishness of man, be not so material, as is usually imagined, to morality and practice, it is certainly of consequence in the speculative science of human nature, and is a proper object of curiosity and inquiry It may not, therefore, be unsuitable, in this place, to bestow a few reflections upon it *

The most obvious objection to the selfish hypothesis, is, that, as it is contrary to common feeling and our most unprejudiced notions, there is required the highest stretch of philosophy to establish so extraordinary a paradox To the most careless observer, there appear to be such dispositions as benevolence and generosity; such affections as love, friendship, compassion, gratitude. These sentiments have their causes, effects, objects, and operations, marked by common language and observation, and plainly distinguished from those of the selfish passions. And as this is the obvious appearance of things, it must be admitted, till some hypothesis be discovered, which, by penetrating deeper into human nature, may prove the former affections to be nothing but modifications of the latter. All attempts of this kind have hitherto proved fruitless, and seem to have proceeded entirely, from that love of *simplicity*, which has been the source of much false reasoning in philosophy. I shall not here enter into any detail on the present subject.

* Benevolence naturally divides into two kinds, the *general* and the *particular*. The first is, where we have no friendship, or connection or esteem for the person, but feel only a general sympathy with him, or a compassion for his pains, and a congratulation with his pleasures. The other species of benevolence is founded on an opinion of virtue, on services done us, or on some particular connection. Both these sentiments must be allowed real in human nature; but whether they will resolve into some nice considerations of self-love, is a question more curious than important. The former sentiment, to wit, that of general benevolence, or humanity, or sympathy, we shall have occasion frequently to treat of in the course of this inquiry; and I assume it as real, from general experience, without any other proof.

Many able philosophers have shown the insufficiency of these systems. And I shall take for granted what, I believe, the smallest reflection will make evident to every impartial inquirer

But the nature of the subject furnishes the strongest presumption, that no better system will ever, for the future, be invented, in order to account for the origin of the benevolent from the selfish affections, and reduce all the various emotions of the human mind to a perfect simplicity. The case is not the same in this species of philosophy as in physics. Many an hypothesis in nature, contrary to first appearances, has been found, on more accurate scrutiny, solid and satisfactory Instances of this kind are so frequent, that a judicious as well as witty philosopher [Fontenelle], has ventured to affirm, if there be more than one way, in which any phenomenon may be produced, that there is a general presumption for its arising from the causes, which are the least obvious and familiar But the presumption always lies on the other side, in all inquiries concerning the origin of our passions, and of the internal operations of the human mind The simplest and most obvious cause, which can there be assigned for any phenomenon, is probably the true one When a philosopher, in the explication of his system, is obliged to have recourse to some very intricate and refined reflections and to suppose them essential to the production of any passion or emotion, we have reason to be extremely on our guard against so fallacious an hypothesis The affections are not susceptible of any impression from the refinements of reason or imagination, and it is always found, that a vigorous exertion of the latter faculties, necessarily, from the narrow capacity of the human mind, destroys all activity in the former Our predominant motive or intention is, indeed, frequently concealed from ourselves, when it is mingled and confounded with other motive, which the mind, from vanity or self conceit, is desirous of supposing more prevalent but there is no instance, that a concealment of this nature has ever arisen from the abstruseness and intricacy of the motive A man, that has lost a friend and patron, may flatter himself that all his grief arises from generous sentiments, without any mixture of narrow or interested considerations but a man that grieves for a valuable friend, who needed his patronage and protection, how can we suppose, that his passionate tenderness arises from some metaphysical regards to a self-interest, which has no foundation or reality? We may as well imagine that minute wheels and springs, like those of a watch, give motion to a loaded waggon, as account for the origin of passion from such abstruse reflections.

Animals are found susceptible of kindness, both to their own species and to ours; nor is there, in this case, the least suspicion of disguise or artifice Shall we account for all *their* sentiments, too, from refined deductions of self-interest? Or if we admit a disinterested

benevolence in the inferior species, by what rule of analogy can we refuse it in the superior?

Love between the sexes begets a complacency and goodwill, very distinct from the gratification of an appetite. Tenderness to their offspring, in all sensible beings, is commonly able alone to counterbalance the strongest motives of self-love, and has no manner of dependence on that affection. What interest can a fond mother have in view, who loses her health by assiduous attendance on her sick child, and afterwards languishes and dies of grief, when freed, by its death, from the slavery of that attendance?

Is gratitude no affection of the human breast, or is that a word merely, without any meaning or reality? Have we no satisfaction in one man's company above another's, and no desire of the welfare of our friend, even though absence or death should prevent us from all participation in it? Or what is it commonly, that gives participation in it, even while alive and present, but our affection and regard to him.

These and a thousand other instances are marks of a general benevolence in human nature, where no *real* interest binds us to the object. And how an *imaginary* interest, known and avowed for such, can be the origin of any passion or emotion, seems difficult to explain. No satisfactory hypothesis of this kind has yet been discovered; nor is there the smallest probability, that the future industry of men will ever be attended with more favourable success.

But farther, if we consider rightly of the matter, we shall find, that the hypothesis which allows of a disinterested benevolence, distinct from self-love, has really more *simplicity* in it, and is more conformable to the analogy of nature, than that which pretends to resolve all friendship and humanity into this latter principle. There are bodily wants or appetites acknowledged by every one, which necessarily precede all sensual enjoyment, and carry us directly to seek possession of the object. Thus, hunger and thirst have eating and drinking for their end; and from the gratification of these primary appetites arises a pleasure, which may become the object of another species of desire or inclination, that is secondary and interested. In the same manner, there are mental passions, by which we are impelled immediately to seek particular objects, such as fame, or power, or vengeance, without any regard to interest; and when these objects are attained, a pleasing enjoyment ensues, as the consequence of our indulged affections. Nature must, by the internal frame and constitution of the mind, give an original propensity to fame ere we can reap any pleasure from that acquisition, or pursue it from motives of self-love, and a desire of happiness. If I have no vanity, I take no delight in praise. If I be void of ambition, power gives me no enjoyment. If I be not angry, the punishment of an adversary is totally indifferent to me. In all

these cases, there is a passion which points immediately to the object, and constitutes it our good or happiness; as there are other secondary passions which afterwards arise, and pursue it as a part of our happiness, when once it is constituted such by our original affections. Were there no appetite of any kind antecedent to self-love, that propensity could scarcely ever exert itself; because we should, in that case, have felt few and slender pains or pleasures, and have little misery or happiness to avoid or to pursue.

Now, where is the difficulty in conceiving, that this may likewise be the case with benevolence and friendship, and that, from the original frame of our temper, we may feel a desire of another's happiness or good, which, by means of that affection, becomes our own good, and is afterwards pursued, from the combined motives of benevolence and self enjoyment? Who sees not that vengeance, from the force alone of passion, may be so eagerly pursued, as to make us knowingly neglect every consideration of ease, interest, or safety; and, like some vindictive animals, infuse our very souls into the wounds we give an enemy?* And what a malignant philosophy must it be, that will not allow, to humanity and friendship, the same privileges, which are indisputably granted to the darker passions of enmity and resentment? Such a philosophy is more like a satire than a true delineation or description of human nature; and may be a good foundation for paradoxical wit and raillery, but is a very bad one for any serious argument or reasoning.

APPENDIX III.—SOME FARTHER CONSIDERATIONS WITH REGARD TO JUSTICE.

THE intention of this Appendix is to give some more particular explication of the origin and nature of Justice, and to mark some differences between it and the other virtues.

The social virtues of humanity and benevolence exert their influence immediately by a direct tendency or instinct, which chiefly keeps in view the simple object, moving the affections, and comprehends not any scheme or system, nor the consequences resulting from the concurrence, imitation, or example of others. A parent flies to the relief of his child; transported by that natural sympathy, which actuates him, and which affords no leisure to reflect on the sentiments or conduct of the rest of mankind in like circumstances. A generous man

* Animasque in vulnere ponunt. VIRG.
Dum alteri noceat, sui negligens, says Seneca of Anger. De Ira, I.

cheerfully embraces an opportunity of serving his friend; because he then feels himself under the dominion of the beneficent affections; nor is he concerned whether any other person in the universe were ever before actuated by such noble motives, or will ever afterwards prove their influence. In all these cases, the social passions have in view a single individual object, and pursue the safety or happiness alone of the person loved and esteemed. With this they are satisfied: in this they acquiesce. And as the good, resulting from their benign influence, is in itself complete and entire, it also excites the moral sentiment of approbation, without any reflection on farther consequences, and without any more enlarged views of the concurrence or imitation of the other members of society. On the contrary, were the generous friend or disinterested patriot to stand alone in the practice of beneficence, this would rather enhance his value in our eyes, and join the praise of rarity and novelty to his other more exalted merits.

The case is not the same with the social virtues of justice and fidelity. They are highly useful, or indeed absolutely necessary to the well-being of mankind: but the benefit, resulting from them, is not the consequence of every individual single act; but arises from the whole scheme or system, concurred in by the whole, or the greater part of the society. General peace and order are the attendants of justice or a general abstinence from the possessions of others: but a particular regard to the particular right of one individual citizen may frequently, considered in itself, be productive of pernicious consequences. The result of the individual acts is here, in many instances, directly opposite to that of the whole system of actions; and the former may be extremely hurtful, while the latter is, to the highest degree, advantageous. Riches, inherited from a parent, are, in a bad man's hand, the instrument of mischief. The right of succession may, in one instance, be hurtful. Its benefit arises only from the observance of the general rule; and it is sufficient, if compensation be thereby made for all the ills and inconveniencies which flow from particular characters and particular situations.

Cyrus, young and unexperienced, considered only the individual case before him, and reflected on a limited fitness and convenience, when he assigned the long coat to the tall boy, and the short coat to the other of smaller size. His governor instructed him better; while he pointed out more enlarged views and consequences, and informed his pupil of the general, inflexible rules, necessary to support general peace and order in society.

The happiness and posperity of mankind, arising from the social virtue of benevolence and its subdivisions, may be compared to a wall, built by many hands, which still rises by each stone, that is [illegible] upon it, and receives increase proportional to the diligence [illegible] of each workman. The same happiness, raised by the [illegible]

of justice and its subdivisions, may be compared to the building of a vault, where each individual stone would, of itself, fall the ground; nor is the whole fabric supported but by the mutual assistance and combination of its corresponding parts.

All the laws of nature, which regulate property, as well as all civil laws, are general, and regard alone some essential circumstances of the case, without taking into consideration the characters, situations, and connections of the person concerned, or any particular consequences which may result from the determination of these laws, in any particular case which offers. They deprive, without scruple, a beneficent man of all his possessions, if acquired by mistake, without a good title, in order to bestow them on a selfish miser, who has already heaped up immense stores of superfluous riches Public utility requires, that property should be regulated by general, inflexible rules, and though such rules are adopted as best serve the same end of public utility, it is impossible for them to prevent all particular hardships, or make beneficial consequences result from every individual case It is sufficient, if the whole plan or scheme be necessary to the support of civil society, and if the balance of good, in the main, do thereby preponderate much above that of evil. Even the general laws of the universe, though planned by Infinite Wisdom, cannot exclude all evil or inconvenience, in every particular operation

It has been asserted by some, that justice arises from HUMAN CONVENTIONS, and proceeds from the voluntary choice, consent, or combination of mankind If by *convention* be here meant a *promise* (which is the most usual sense of the word), nothing can be more absurd than this position The observance of promises is itself one of the most considerable parts of justice, and we are not surely bound to keep our word, because we have given our word to keep it. But if by convention be meant a sense of common interest, which sense each man feels in his own breast, which he remarks in his fellows, and which carries him, in concurrence with others, into a general plan or system of actions, which tends to public utility, it must be owned, that, in this sense, justice arises from human conventions. For if it be allowed (what is, indeed, evident) that the particular consequences of a particular act of justice may be hurtful to the public as well as to individuals it follows, that every man, in embracing that virtue, must have an eye to the whole plan or system, and must expect the concurrence of his fellows in the same conduct and behaviour. Did all his views terminate in the consequences of each act of his own, his benevolence and humanity, as well as his self-love, might often prescribe to him measures of conduct very different from those, which are agreeable to the strict rules of right and justice.

Thus two men pull the oars of a boat by common convention, for common interest, without any promise or contract: thus gold and silver

are made the measures of exchange; thus speech, and words, and language, are fixed, by human convention and agreement. Whatever is advantageous to two or more persons, if all perform their part; but what loses all advantage, if only one perform, can arise from no other principle. There would otherwise be no motive for any one of them to enter into that scheme of conduct.*

The word, *natural*, is commonly taken in so many senses, and is of so loose a signification, that it seems vain to dispute whether justice be natural or not. If self-love, if benevolence be natural to man; if reason and forethought be also natural; then may the same epithet be applied to justice, order, fidelity, property, society. Men's inclination, their necessities, lead them to combine; their understanding and experience tell them, that this combination is impossible, where each governs himself by no rule, and pays no regard to the possessions of others: and from these passions and reflections conjoined, as soon as we observe like passions and reflections, in others, the sentiment of justice, throughout all ages, has infallibly and certainly had place, to some degree or other, in every individual of the human species. In so sagacious an animal, what necessarily arises from the exertion of his intellectual faculties, may justly be esteemed natural.†

Among all civilized nations, it has been the constant endeavour to remove every thing arbitrary and partial from the decision of property, and to fix the sentence of judges by such general views and considerations, as may be equal to every member of the society. For besides, that nothing could be more dangerous than to accustom the bench, even in the smallest instance, to regard private friendship or enmity; it is certain, that men, where they imagine that there was no other reason for the preference of their adversary but personal favour, are apt to entertain the strongest ill-will against the magistrates and judges. When natural reason, therefore, points out no fixed view of public utility, by which a controversy of property can be decided, positive

* This theory, concerning the origin of property, and consequently of justice, is, in the main, the same with that hinted at and adopted by Grotius. 'Hinc discimus, quae fuerit 'causa, ob quam a primæva communione rerum primo mobilium, deinde et immobilium dis-'cessum est: nimirum quod cum non contenti homines vesci sponte natis, antra habitare, corpore aut nudo agere, aut corticibus arborum ferarumve pellibus vestito, vitæ genus 'exquisitius delegissent, industria opus fuit, quam singuli rebus singulis adhiberent: quo 'minus autem fructus in commune conferrentur, primum obstitit locorum, in quæ homines discesserunt, distantia, deinde justitiæ et amoris defectus, per quem fiebat, ut nec in labore, 'nec in consumptione fructuum, quæ debebat, æqualitas servaretur. Simul discimus, quo 'modo res in proprietatem iverint; non animi actu solo, neque enim scire alii poterant, quid 'alii suum esse vellent, ut eo abstinerent, et idem velle plures poterant; sed pacto quodam 'aut expresso, ut per divisionem, aut tacito, ut per occupationem.' De jure belli et pacis. Lib. ii. cap. 2. sect. 2. art. 4 & 5.

† Natural may be opposed either to what is *unusual*, *miraculous*, or *artificial*. In the two former senses, justice and property are undoubtedly natural. But as they suppose reason, forethought, design, and a social union and confederacy among men, perhaps that epithet cannot strictly, in the last sense, be applied to them. Had men lived without society, property had never been known, and neither justice nor injustice had ever existed. But society among human creatures had been impossible without reason and forethought. Inferior animals, that unite, are guided by instinct, which supplies the place of reason. But all these disputes are merely verbal.

laws are often framed to supply its place, and direct the procedure of all courts of judicature. Where these two fail, as often happens, precedents are called for, and a former decision, though given itself without any sufficient reason, justly becomes a sufficient reason for a new decision. If direct laws and precedents be wanting, imperfect and indirect ones are brought in aid, and the controverted case is ranged under them, by analogical reasonings and comparisons, and similitudes and correspondencies, which are often more fanciful than real. In general, it may safely be affirmed, that jurisprudence is, in this respect, different from all the sciences, and that in many of its nicer questions, there cannot properly be said to be truth or falsehood on either side. If one pleader bring the case under any former law precedent, by a refined analogy or comparison, the opposite pleader is not at a loss to find an opposite analogy or comparison: and the preference given by the judge is often founded more on taste and imagination than on any solid argument. Public utility is the general object of all courts of judicature, and this utility, too, requires a stable rule in all controversies: but where several rules, nearly equal and indifferent, present themselves, it is a very slight turn of thought which fixes the decision in favour of either party.*

* That there be a separation or distinction of possessions, and that this separation be steady and constant; this is absolutely required by the interests of society, and hence the origin of justice and property. What possessions are assigned to particular persons; this is, generally speaking, pretty indifferent; and is often determined by very frivolous views and considerations. We shall mention a few particulars.

Were a society formed among several independent members, the most obvious rule, which could be agreed on, would be to annex property to *present* possession, and leave every one a right to what he at present enjoys. The relation of possession, which takes place between the person and the object, naturally draws on the relation of property.

For a like reason, occupation or first possession becomes the foundation of property.

Where a man bestows labour and industry upon any object, which before belonged to no body; as in cutting down and shaping a tree, in cultivating a field, &c. the alterations which he produces causes a relation between him and the object, and naturally engages us to annex it to him by the new relation of property. This cause here concurs with the public utility, which consists in the encouragement given to industry and labour.

Perhaps, too, private humanity towards the possessor concurs in this instance, with the other motives, and engages us to leave with him what he has acquired by his sweat and labour, and what he has flattered himself in the constant enjoyment of. For though private humanity can by no means be the origin of justice, since the latter virtue so often contradicts the former; yet when the rule of separate and constant possession is once formed by the indispensable necessities of society, private humanity, and an aversion to the doing a hardship to another, may, in a particular instance, give rise to a particular rule of property.

I am much inclined to think, that the right of succession or inheritance much depends on those connections of the imagination, and that the relation to a former proprietor begetting a relation to the object, is the cause why the property is transferred to a man after the death of his kinsman. It is true, industry is more encouraged by the transference of possession to children or near relations: but this consideration will only have place in a cultivated society; whereas the right of succession is regarded even among the greatest Barbarians.

Acquisition of property, by *accession*, can be explained no way but by having recourse to the relations and connections of the imagination.

The property of rivers, by the laws of most nations, and by the natural turn of our thoughts, is attributed to the proprietors of their banks, excepting such vast rivers as the Rhine or the Danube, which seem too large to follow as an accession to the property of the neighbouring fields. Yet even these rivers are considered as the property of that nation, through whose dominions they run; the idea of a nation being of a suitable bulk to correspond with them, and bear them such a relation in the fancy.

The accessions, which are made to land, bordering upon rivers, follow the land, say the civilians, provided it be made by what they call *alluvion*, that is, insensibly and imperceptibly; which are circumstances that assist the imagination in the conjunction.

We may just observe, before we conclude this subject, that, after the laws of justice are fixed by views of general utility, the injury, the hardship, the harm, which result to an individual from a violation of them, enter very much into consideration, and are a great source of that universal blame, which attends every wrong or iniquity. By the laws of society, this coat, this horse is mine, and *ought* to remain perpetually in my possession. I reckon on the secure enjoyment of it; by depriving me of it, you disappoint my expectations, and doubly displease me, and offend every bystander. It is a public wrong, so far as the rules of equity are violated: it is a private harm, so far as an individual is injured. And though the second consideration could have no place, were not the former previously established; for otherwise the distinction of *mine* and *thine* would be unknown in society: yet there is no question, but the regard to general good is much enforced by the respect to particular. What injures the community, without hurting any individual, is often more lightly thought of. But where the greatest public wrong is also conjoined with a considerable private one, no wonder the highest disapprobation attends so iniquitous a behaviour.

APPENDIX IV.—OF SOME VERBAL DISPUTES.

NOTHING is more usual than for philosophers to encroach upon the province of grammarians, and to engage in disputes of words, while they imagine that they are handling controversies of the deepest importance and concern. It was in order to avoid altercations, so frivolous and endless, that I endeavoured to state, with the utmost caution, the object of our present inquiry, and proposed simply to collect, on the one hand, a list of those mental qualities which are the object of love or esteem, and form a part of personal merit; and, on the other hand, a catalogue of those qualities which are the object of censure or reproach, and which detract from the character of the person possessed of them; subjoining some reflections concerning the origin of these sentiments of praise or blame. On all occasions, where there

Where there is any considerable portion torn at once from one bank and added to another, it becomes not *his* property whose land it falls on till it unite with the land, and till the trees and plants have spread their roots into both. Before that, the thought does not sufficiently join them.

In short, we must ever distinguish between the necessity of a separation and constancy in men's possession, and the rules which assign particular objects to particular persons. [illegible] necessity is obvious, strong, and invincible: the latter may depend on [illegible] more light and frivolous, on the sentiment of private humanity and aversion [illegible], on positive laws, on precedents, analogies, and very fine [illegible] imagination.

might arise the least hesitation, I avoided the terms *virtue* and *vice*; because some of those qualities which I classed among the objects of praise receive, in the English language, the appellation of *talents*, rather than of virtues; as some of the blameable or censurable qualities are often called *defects* rather than vices. It may now, perhaps, be expected, that, before we conclude this moral inquiry, we should exactly separate the one from the other, should mark the precise boundaries of virtues and talents, vices and defects, and should explain the reason and origin of that distinction. But in order to excuse myself from this undertaking, which would at last prove only a grammatical inquiry, I shall subjoin the four following reflections, which shall contain all that I intend to say on the present subject.

I. I do not find, that in the English or any other modern tongue, the boundaries are exactly fixed between virtues and talents, vices and defects; or that a precise definition can be given of the one as contradistinguished from the other. Were we to say, for instance, that the esteemable qualities alone, which are voluntary, are entitled to the appellation of virtues, we should soon recollect the qualities of courage, equanimity, patience, self-command, with many others, which almost every language classes under this appellation, though they depend little or not at all on our choice. Should we affirm that the qualities alone, which prompt us to act our part in society, are entitled to that honourable distinction, it must immediately occur, that these are indeed the most valuable qualities, and are commonly denominated the *social* virtues, but that this very epithet supposes that there are also virtues of another species. Should we lay hold of the distinction between *intellectual* and *moral* endowments, and affirm the last alone to be the real and genuine virtues, because they alone lead to action, we should find that many of those qualities, usually called intellectual virtues, such as prudence, penetration, discernment, discretion, had also a considerable influence on conduct. The distinction between the *heart* and the *head* may also be adopted: the qualities of the first may be defined such as in their immediate exertion are accompanied with a feeling or sentiment, and these alone may be called the genuine virtues: but industry, frugality, temperance, secrecy, perseverance, and many other laudable powers or habits, generally styled virtues, are exerted without any immediate sentiment in the person possessed of them; and are only known to him by their effects. It is fortunate, amidst all this seeming perplexity, that the question, being merely verbal, cannot possibly be of any importance. A moral, philosophical discourse, needs not enter into all these caprices of language, which are so variable in different dialects, and in different ages of the same dialect. But on the whole, it seems to me, that, though it is always allowed that there are virtues of many different kinds, yet, when a man is called virtuous, or is denominated a man of virtue, we chiefly

regard his social qualities, which are, indeed, the most valuable. It is, at the same time, certain that any remarkable defect in courage, temperance, economy, industry, understanding, dignity of mind, would bereave even a very good-natured, honest man, of this honourable appellation. Who did ever say, except by way of irony, that such a one was a man of great virtue, but an egregious blockhead?

II. It is no wonder, that languages should not be very precise in marking the boundaries between virtues and talents, vices and defects; since there is so little distinction made in our internal estimation of them. It seems indeed certain, that the *sentiment* of conscious worth, the self-satisfaction proceeding from a review of a man's own conduct and character; it seems certain, I say, that this sentiment, which, though the most common of all others, has no proper name in our language,* arises from the endowments of courage and capacity, industry and ingenuity, as well as from any other mental excellencies. Who, on the other hand, is not deeply mortified with reflecting on his own folly and dissoluteness, and feels not a secret sting or compunction, whenever his memory presents any past occurrence, where he behaved with stupidity or ill manners? No time can efface the cruel ideas of a man's own foolish conduct, or of affronts, which cowardice or imprudence has brought upon him. They still haunt his solitary hours, damp his most aspiring thoughts, and show him, even to himself, in the most contemptible and most odious colours imaginable.

What is there, too, we are more anxious to conceal from others than such blunders, infirmities, and meannesses, or more dread to have exposed by raillery and satire? And is not the chief object of vanity, our bravery or learning, our wit or breeding, our eloquence or address, our taste or abilities? These we display with care, if not with ostentation; and we commonly show more ambition of excelling in them, than even in the social virtues themselves, which are, in reality, of such superior excellence. Good-nature and honesty, especially the latter, are so indispensably required, that, though the greatest censure attends any violation of these duties, no eminent praise follows such common instances of them, as seem essential to the support of human society. And hence the reason, in my opinion, why, though men often extol so liberally the qualities of their heart, they are shy in commending the endowments of their head: because the latter virtues, being supposed more rare and extraordinary, are observed to be the more usual objects of pride and self-conceit; and when boasted of, beget a strong suspicion of these sentiments.

* The term, Pride, is commonly taken in a bad sense; but this sentiment seems indifferent, and may be either good or bad, according as it is well or ill founded, and according to the other circumstances which accompany it. The French express this sentiment by the term, *amour propre*; but as they also express self love as well as vanity by the same term, there arises thence a great confusion in Rochefoucault, and many of their moral writers.

It is hard to tell, whether you hurt a man's character most by calling him a knave or a coward, and whether a beastly glutton or drunkard be not as odious and contemptible, as a selfish, ungenerous miser. Give me my choice, and I would rather, for my own happiness and self-enjoyment, have a friendly humane heart, than possess all the other virtues of Demosthenes and Philip united. But I would rather pass with the world for one endowed with extensive genius and intrepid courage, and should thence expect stronger instances of general applause and admiration. The figure which a man makes in life, the reception which he meets with in company, the esteem paid him by his acquaintance, all these advantages depends as much upon his good sense and judgment, as upon any other part of his character. Had a man the best intentions in the world, and were the farthest removed from all injustice and violence, he would never be able to make himself much regarded, without a moderate share, at least, of parts and understanding.

What is it then we can here dispute about? If sense and courage, temperance and industry, wisdom and knowledge, confessedly form a considerable part of *personal merit*: if a man possessed of these qualities, is both better satisfied with himself, and better entitled to the good-will, esteem, and services of others, than one entirely destitute of them; if, in short, the *sentiments* are similar which arise from these endowments and from the social virtues; is there any reason for being so extremely scrupulous about a *word*, or disputing whether they be entitled to the denomination of virtues? It may, indeed, be pretended, that the sentiment of approbation, which those accomplishments produce, besides its being *inferior*, is also somewhat *different* from that which attends the virtues of justice and humanity. But this seems not a sufficient reason for ranking them entirely under different classes and appellations. The character of Cæsar and that of Cato, as drawn by Sallust, are both of them virtuous, in the strictest and most limited sense of the word; but in a different way: nor are the sentiments entirely the same which arise from them. The one produces love; the other esteem: the one is amiable; the other awful: we should wish to meet the one character in a friend; the other we should be ambitious of in ourselves. In like manner, the approbation, which attends temperance, or industry, or frugality, may be somewhat different from that which is paid to the social virtues, without making them entirely of a different species. And, indeed, we may observe, that these endowments, more than the other virtues, produce not, all of them, the same kind of approbation. Good sense and genius beget esteem and regard: wit and humour excite love and affection*.

* Love and esteem are nearly the same passion, and arise from similar causes. The qualities, which produce both, are such as communicate pleasure. But where this pleasure is

Most people, I believe, will naturally, without premeditation, assent to the definition of the elegant and judicious poet.

> Virtue (for mere good nature is a fool)
> Is sense and spirit with humanity.*

What pretensions has a man to our generous assistance or good offices, who has dissipated his wealth in profuse expenses, idle vanities, chimerical projects, dissolute pleasures, or extravagant gaming? These vices (for we scruple not to call them such) bring misery unpitied, and contempt on every one addicted to them.

Achaeus, a wise and prudent prince, fell into a fatal snare, which cost him his crown and life, after having used every reasonable precaution to guard himself against it. On that account, says the historian, he is a just object of regard and compassion. His betrayers alone of hatred and contempt. [Polyb., lib. viii. cap. 2.]

The precipitate flight and improvident negligence of Pompey, at the beginning of the civil wars, appeared such notorious blunders to Cicero, as quite palled his friendship towards that great man. *In the same manner*, says he, *as want of cleanliness, decency, or discretion in a mistress, are found to alienate our affections.* For so he expresses himself, where he talks, not in the character of a philosopher, but in that of a statesman and man of the world, to his friend Atticus. [Lib. ix. epist. 10.]

But the same Cicero, in imitation of all the ancient moralists, when he reasons as a philosopher, enlarges very much his ideas of virtue, and comprehends every laudable quality or endowment of the mind, under that honourable appellation. This leads to the *third* reflection, which we proposed to make, (to wit), that the ancient moralists, the best models, made no material distinction among the different species of mental endowments and defects, but treated all alike under the appellation of virtues and vices, and made them indiscriminately the object of their moral reasonings. The *prudence* explained in Cicero's *Offices*, [Lib. i. cap. 6.] is that sagacity, which leads to the discovery of truth, and preserves us from error and mistake. *Magnanimity, temperance, decency*, are there also at large discoursed of. And as that

severe and serious; or where its object is great, and makes a strong impression; or where it produces any degree of humility and awe: in all these cases, the passion which arises from the pleasure is more properly denominated esteem than love. Benevolence attends both; but is connected with love in a more eminent degree. There seems to be still a stronger mixture of pride in contempt, than of humility and esteem; and the reason would not be difficult to one who studied accurately the passions. All these various mixtures, and compositions, and appearances of sentiment, form a very curious subject of speculation, but are wide of our present purpose. Throughout this inquiry, we always consider in general what qualities are a subject of praise or of censure, without entering into all the minute differences of sentiment which they excite. It is evident, that whatever is contemned, is also disliked, as well as what is hated; and we here endeavour to take objects, according to their most simple views and appearances. These sciences are but too apt to appear abstract to common readers, even with all the precautions which we can take to clear them from superfluous speculations, and bring them down to every capacity.

* The Art of Preserving Health. Book IV.

eloquent moralist followed the common received division of the four cardinal virtues, our social duties form but one head, in the general distribution of his subject.*

We need only peruse the titles of chapters in Aristotle's Ethics to be convinced, that he ranks courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, modesty, prudence, and a manly openness, among the virtues, as well as justice and friendship

To *sustain* and to *abstain*, that is, to be patient and to be continent, appeared to some of the ancients a summary comprehension of all morals

Epictetus has scarcely ever mentioned the sentiment of humanity and compassion, but in order to put his disciples on their guard against it. The virtue of the *Stoics* seems to consist chiefly in a firm temper and a sound understanding With them, as with Solomon and the eastern moralists, folly and wisdom are equivalent to vice and virtue

Men will praise thee, says David, [Psalm xlix] when thou dost well unto thyself I hate a wise man, says the Greek poet, who is not wise to himself*

Plutarch is no more cramped by systems in his philosophy than in his history Where he compares the great men of Greece and Rome, he fairly sets in opposition all their blemishes and accomplishments of whatever kind, and omits nothing considerable, which can either depress or exalt their characters His moral discourses contain the same free and natural censure of men and manners

The character of Hannibal, as drawn by Livy, [Lib xxi cap. 4.] is esteemed partial, but allows him many eminent virtues Never was there a genius, says the historian more equally fitted for those opposite offices of commanding and obeying, and it were, therefore, difficult to determine whether he rendered himself *dearer* to the general or to the army To none would Hasdrubal entrust more willingly the conduct of any dangerous enterprise, under none did the soldiers discover more courage and confidence Great boldness in facing danger, great prudence in the midst of it No labour could fatigue his body or subdue his mind. Cold and heat were indifferent to him

* The following passage of Cicero is worth quoting as being the most clear and express to our purpose that anything can be imagined and, in a dispute which is chiefly verbal must, on account of the author, carry an authority from which there can be no appeal.

'Virtus autem, quae est per se, ipsa laudabilis, et sine qua nihil, laudari potest, tamen habet plures partes, quarum alia est alia ad laudationem aptior Sunt enim aliae virtutes, quae videntur in moribus hominum, et quadam comitate ac beneficentia positae aliae quae in ingenii aliqua facultate, aut animi magnitudine ac robore. Nam clementia, justitia, benignitas, fides, fortitudo in periculis communibus, jucunda est auditu in laudationibus. Omnes enim hae virtutes non tam ipsis, qui eas in se habent, quam generi hominum fructuosae putantur. Sapientia et magnitudo animi, qua omnes res humanae tenues et pro nihilo putantur; et in cogitando vis quaedam ingenii, et ipsa eloquentia admirationis habet non minus, jucunditatis minus. Ipsos enim magis videtur, quos laudamus, quam illos, apud quos laudamus, ornare ac tueri: sed tamen in laudanda jungenda sunt etiam haec genera virtutum. Ferunt enim aures hominum, cum illa quae jucunda et grata, tum etiam illa, quae mirabilia sunt in virtute, laudari.' De Orat. lib. ii. cap. 84.

* Μισῶ σοφιστὴν ὅστις οὐχ αὑτῷ σοφός Euripides

meat and drink he sought as supplies to the necessities of nature, not as gratifications of his voluptuous appetites. Walking or rest he used indiscriminately, by night or by day.—These great VIRTUES were balanced by great VICES. Inhuman cruelty; perfidy more than *punic*; no truth, no faith, no regard to oaths, promises, or religion.

The character of Alexander VI., to be found in Guicciardin, [Lib. i.] is pretty similar, but juster; and is a proof, that even the moderns, where they speak naturally, hold the same language with the ancients. In this pope, says he, there was a singular capacity and judgment: admirable prudence; a wonderful talent of persuasion; and in all momentous enterprises, a diligence and dexterity incredible. But these *virtues* were infinitely overbalanced by his *vices*; no faith, no religion, insatiable avarice, exorbitant ambition, and a more than barbarous cruelty.

Polybius, [Lib. xii.] reprehending Timæus for his partiality against Agathocles, whom he himself allows to be the most cruel and impious of all tyrants, says: if he took refuge in Syracuse, as asserted by that historian, flying the dirt and smoke, and toil, of his former profession of a potter; and if, proceeding from such slender beginnings, he became master, in a little time, of all Sicily; brought the Carthaginian state into the utmost danger; and at last died in old age, and in possession of sovereign dignity: must he not be allowed something prodigious and extraordinary, and to have possessed great talents and capacity for business and action? His historian, therefore, ought not to have alone related what tended to his reproach and infamy; but also what might redound to his PRAISE and HONOUR.

In general, we may observe, that the distinction of voluntary or involuntary was little regarded by the ancients in their moral reasonings; where they frequently treated the question as very doubtful, *whether virtue could be taught or not*?* They justly considered, that cowardice, meanness, levity, anxiety, impatience, folly, and many other qualities of the mind, might appear ridiculous and deformed, contemptible and odious, though independent of the will. Nor could it be supposed, at all times, in every man's power to attain every kind of mental, more than of exterior beauty.

And here there recurs the *fourth* reflection which I purposed to make, in suggesting the reason, why modern philosophers have often followed a course, in their moral inquiries, so different from that of the ancients. In later times, philosophy of all kinds, especially ethics, have been more closely united with theology than ever they were observed to be among the Heathens; and as this latter science admits of no terms of composition, but bends every branch of knowledge to its own purpose, without much regard to the phenomena of nature, or

* Vid. Plato in Menone, Seneca *de otio sap.* cap. 31. So also Horace, [illegible] *naturane donet.* Epist. lib. i. ep. 18. *Æschines* Socraticus, Dial.

to the unbiassed sentiments of the mind, hence reasoning, and even language, have been warped from their natural course, and distinctions have been endeavoured to be established, where the difference of the object was, in a manner, imperceptible Philosophers, or rather divines under that disguise, treating all morals as on a like footing with civil laws, guarded by the sanctions of reward and punishment, were necessarily led to render this circumstance, of *voluntary* or *involuntary*, the foundation of their whole theory Every one may employ *terms* in what sense he pleases but this, in the meantime, must be allowed, that *sentiments* are every day experienced of blame and praise, which have objects beyond the dominion of the will or choice, and of which it behoves us, if not as moralists, as speculative philosophers at least, to give some satisfactory theory or explication

A blemish, a fault, a vice, a crime, these expressions seem to denote different degrees of censure and disapprobation, which are however, all of them, at the bottom, pretty nearly of the same kind of species The explication of one will easily lead us into a just conception of the others, and it is of greater consequence to attend to things than to verbal appellations That we owe a duty to ourselves is confessed even in the most vulgar system of morals, and it must be of consequence to examine that duty, in order to see, whether it bears any affinity to that which we owe to society It is probable that the approbation, attending the observance of both, is of a similar nature, and arises from similar principles, whatever appellation we may give to either of these excellencies

---

A DIALOGUE.

MY friend PALAMEDES, who is as great a rambler in his principles as in his person, and who has run over, by study and travel, almost every region of the intellectual and material world, surprised me lately with an account of a nation, with whom, he told me, he had passed a considerable part of his life, and whom he found, in the main, a people extremely civilized and intelligent.

There is a country, said he, in the world, called FOURLI, no matter for its longitude or latitude, whose inhabitants have ways of thinking, in many things, particularly in morals, diametrically opposite to ours. When I came among them, I found that I must submit to double pains; first to learn the meaning of the terms in their language, and then to know the import of those terms, and the praise or blame at-

tached to them After a word had been explained to me, and a character, which it expressed, had been described, I concluded that such an epithet must necessarily be the greatest reproach in the world, and was extremely surprised to find one in a public company, apply it to a person, with whom he lived in the strictest intimacy and friendship. *You fancy*, said I, one day, to an acquaintance, *that* CHANGUIS *is your mortal enemy I love to extinguish quarrels, and I must, therefore, tell you, that I heard him talk of you in the most obliging manner* But to my great astonishment, when I repeated CHANGUIS' words, though I had both remembered and understood them perfectly, I found, that they were taken for the most mortal affront, and that I had very innocently rendered the breach between these persons altogether irreparable

As it was my fortune to come among this people on a very advantageous footing, I was immediately introduced to the best company, and being desired by ALCHEIC to live with him, I readily accepted of his invitation, as I found him universally esteemed for his personal merit, and indeed regarded by every one in FOURLI as a perfect character

One evening he invited me, as an amusement, to bear him company in a serenade, which he intended to give to GULKI, with whom, he told me, he was extremely enamoured, and I soon found that his taste was not singular for we met many of his rivals, who had come on the same errand I very naturally concluded, that this mistress of his must be one of the finest women in town, and I already felt a secret inclination to see her, and be acquainted with her. But as the moon began to rise I was much surprised to find, that we were in the midst of the university where GULKI studied and I was somewhat ashamed for having attended my friend on such an errand.

I was afterwards told, that ALCHEIC'S choice of GULKI was very much approved of by all the good company in town, and that it was expected, while he gratified his own passion, he would perform to that young man the same good office, which he had himself owed to ELCOUF It seems ALCHEIC had been very handsome in his youth, had been courted by many lovers, but had bestowed his favours chiefly on the sage ELCOUF, to whom he was supposed to owe, in a great measure, the astonishing progress which he had made in philosophy and virtue

It gave me some surprise, that ALCHEIC'S wife (who by the bye happened also to be his sister) was nowise scandalised at this species of infidelity.

Much about the same time I discovered (for it was not [illegible] to be kept a secret from me or any body) that ALCHEIC [illegible] and a parricide, and had put to death an innocent person, [illegible] nearly connected with him, and whom he was bound to [illegible]

defend by all the ties of nature and humanity. When I asked, with all the caution and deference imaginable, what was his motive for this action, he replied coolly, that he was not then so much at ease in his circumstances as he is at present, and that he had acted, in that particular, by the advice of all his friends.

Having heard ALCHEIC'S virtue so extremely celebrated, I pretended to join in the general voice of acclamation, and only asked, by way of curiosity, as a stranger, which of all his noble actions was most highly applauded; and I soon found, that all sentiments were united in giving the preference to the assassination of USBEK. This USBEK had been to the last moment ALCHEIC'S intimate friend, had laid many high obligations upon him, had even saved his life on a certain occasion, and had, by his will, which was found after the murder, made him heir to a considerable part of his fortune. ALCHEIC, it seems, conspired with about twenty or thirty more, most of them also USBEK'S friends; and falling altogether on that unhappy man, when he was not aware, they had torn him with a hundred wounds; and given him that reward for all his past favours and obligations. USBEK, said the general voice of the people, had many great and good qualities: his very vices were shining, magnificent, and generous: but this action of ALCHEIC'S sets him far above USBEK in the eyes of all judges of merit; and is one of the noblest that ever perhaps the sun shone upon.

Another part of ALCHEIC'S conduct, which I also found highly applauded, was his behaviour towards CALISH, with whom he was joined in a project or undertaking of some importance. CALISH, being a passionate man, gave ALCHEIC, one day, a sound drubbing; which he took very patiently, waited the return of CALISH'S good humour, kept still a fair correspondence with him; and by that means brought the affair, in which they were joined, to a happy issue, and gained to himself immortal honour by his remarkable temper and moderation.

I have lately received a letter from a correspondent in FOURLI, by which I learn, that, since my departure, ALCHEIC, falling into a bad state of health, has fairly hanged himself, and has died universally regretted and applauded in that country. So virtuous and noble a life, says each FOURLIAIN, could not be better crowned than by so noble an end; and ALCHEIC has proved by this, as well as by all his other actions, what was his constant principle during his life, and what he boasted of near his last moments, that a wise man is scarcely inferior to the great god, VITZLI. This is the name of the supreme deity among the Fourliains.

The notions of this people, continued PALAMEDES, are as extraordinary with regard to good-manners and sociableness, as with regard to morals. My friend ALCHEIC formed once a party for my entertainment, composed of all the prime wits and philosophers of FOURLI;

and each of us brought his mess along with him to the place where we assembled. I observed one of them to be worse provided than the rest, and offered him a share of my mess, which happened to be a roasted pullet and I could not but remark, that he and all the rest of the company smiled at my simplicity I was told that ALCHEIC had once so much interest with his club as to prevail with them to eat in common, and that he had made use of an artifice for that purpose. He persuaded those, whom he observed to be *worst* provided, to offer their mess to the company, after which, the others, who had brought more delicate fare, were ashamed not to make the same offer This is regarded as so extraordinary an event, that it has since, as I learn, been recorded in the history of ALCHEIC'S life, composed by one of the greatest geniuses of FOURLI

Pray, said I, PALAMEDES, when you were at FOURLI, did you also learn the art of turning your friends into ridicule, by telling them strange stories, and then laughing at them, if they believed you? I assure you, replied he, had I been disposed to learn such a lesson, there was no place in the world more proper My friend, so often mentioned, did nothing, from morning to night, but sneer, and banter, and rally, and you could scarcely ever distinguish, whether he were in jest or earnest But you think, then, that my story is improbable, and that I have used, or rather abused the privilege of a traveller To be sure, said I, you were but in jest. Such barbarous and savage manners are not only incompatible with a civilized intelligent people, such as you said these were, but are scarcely compatible with human nature They exceed all we ever read of, among the MINGRELIANS and TOPINAMBOUFS

Have a care, cried he, have a care! You are not aware that you are speaking blasphemy, and are abusing your favourites, the Greeks, especially the Athenians, whom I have couched, all along, under these bizarre names I employed If you consider aright, there is not one stroke of the foregoing character, which might not be found in the man of highest merit at Athens, without diminishing in the least from the brightness of his character The amours of the Greeks, their marriages,* and the exposing of their children, cannot but strike you immediately The death of USBEK is an exact counterpart to that of Cæsar

All to a trifle, said I, interrupting him you did not mention that USBEK was an usurper

I did not, replied he, lest you should discover the parallel I aimed at. But even adding this circumstance, we should make no scruple, according to our sentiments of morals, to denominate Brutus and Cassius ungrateful traitors and assassins though you know, that they

* The laws of Athens allowed a man to marry his sister by the father Solon's law forbids pederasty to slaves, as being an act of too great dignity for such mean persons

are, perhaps, the highest characters of all antiquity, and the Athenians erected statues to them, which they placed near those of Harmodius and Aristogiton, their own deliverers And if you think this circumstance, which you mention, so material to absolve these patriots, I shall compensate it by another, not mentioned, which will equally aggravate their crime. A few days before the execution of their fatal purpose, they all swore fealty to Cæsar, and protesting to hold his person ever sacred, they touched the altar with those hands which they had already armed for his destruction *

I need not remind you of the famous and applauded story of Themistocles, and of his patience towards Eurybiades, the Spartan, his commanding officer, who, heated by debate, lifted his cane to him in a council of war (the same thing as if he had cudgelled him), *Strike*, cries the Athenian, *strike, but hear me*

You are too good a scholar not to discover the ironical Socrates and his Athenian club in my last story, and you will certainly observe, that it is exactly copied from Xenophon, with a variation only of the names [Mem Soc lib iii sub fine] And I think I have fairly made it appear, that an Athenian man of merit might be such a one as with us would pass for incestuous, a parricide, an assassin, an ungrateful perjured traitor, and something else too abominable to be named, not to mention his rusticity and ill-manners And having lived in this manner, his death might be entirely suitable he might conclude the scene by a desperate act of self murder, and die with the most absurd blasphemies in his mouth And notwithstanding all this, he shall have statues, if not altars, erected to his memory, poems and orations shall be composed in his praise, great sects shall be proud of calling themselves by his name, and the most distant posterity shall blindly continue their admiration though were such a one to arise among themselves, they would justly regard him with horror and execration.

I might have been aware, replied I, of your artifice You seem to take pleasure in this topic and are indeed the only man I ever knew, who was well acquainted with the ancients and did not extremely admire them. But instead of attacking their philosophy, their eloquence, or poetry, the usual subjects of controversy between us, you now seem to impeach their morals, and accuse them of ignorance in a science, which is the only one, in my opinion, in which they are not surpassed by the moderns Geometry, physics, astronomy, anatomy, botany, geography, navigation, in these we justly claim the superiority but what have we to oppose to their moralists? Your representation of things is fallacious. You have no indulgence for the manners and customs of different ages. Would you try a

* Appian. Bell. Civ lib. iii. Suetonius in vita Cæsaris.

Greek or Roman by the common law of England? Here let him defend himself by his own maxims, and then pronounce.

There are no manners so innocent or reasonable, but may be rendered odious or ridiculous, if measured by a standard, unknown to the persons, especially, if you employ a little art or eloquence, in aggravating some circumstances, and extenuating others, as best suits the purpose of your discourse All these artifices may easily be retorted on you Could I inform the Athenians, for instance, that there was a nation, in which adultery, both active and passive, so to speak, was in the highest vogue and esteem in which every man of education chose for his mistress a married woman, the wife, perhaps, of his friend and companion, and valued himself upon these infamous conquests, as much as if he had been several times a conqueror in boxing or wrestling at the *Olympic* games in which every man also took a pride in his tameness and facility with regard to his own wife, and was glad to make friends or gain interest by allowing her to prostitute her charms, and even, without any such motive, gave her full liberty and indulgence I ask, what sentiments the Athenians would entertain of such a people; they who never mentioned the crime of adultery but in conjunction with robbery and poisoning? Which would they admire most, the villainy or the meanness of such a conduct?

Should I add, that the same people were as proud of their slavery and dependence as the Athenians of their liberty, and though a man among them were oppressed, disgraced, impoverished, insulted, or imprisoned by the tyrant, he would still regard it as the highest merit to love, serve, and obey him, and even to die for his smallest glory or satisfaction these noble Greeks would probably ask me, whether I spoke of a human society, or of some inferior, servile species.

It was then I might inform my Athenian audience, that these people, however, wanted not spirit and bravery, If a man, says I, though their intimate friend, should throw out, in a private company, a raillery against them, nearly approaching any of those, with which your generals and demagogues every day regale each other, in the face of the whole city, they never can forgive him, but in order to revenge themselves, they oblige him immediately to run them through the body, or be himself murdered And if a man, who is an absolute stranger to them, should desire them, at the peril of their own life, to cut the throat of their bosom-companion, they immediately obey, and think themselves highly obliged and honoured by the commission. These are their maxims of honour this is their favourite morality

But though so ready to draw their swords against their friends and countrymen, no disgrace, no infamy, no pain, no poverty, will ever engage these people to turn the point of it against their own breast.

A man of rank would row in the galleys, would beg his bread, would languish in prison, would suffer any tortures, and still preserve his wretched life. Rather than escape his enemies by a generous contempt of death, he would infamously receive the same death from his enemies, aggravated by their triumphant insults, and by the most exquisite sufferings.

It is very usual too, continue I, among this people, to erect jails, where every art of plaguing and tormenting the unhappy prisoners is carefully studied and practised: and in these jails it is usual for a parent voluntarily to shut up several of his children, in order that another child, whom he owns to have no greater or rather less merit than the rest, may enjoy his whole fortune, and wallow in every kind of voluptuousness and pleasure. Nothing so virtuous in their opinion as this barbarous partiality.

But what is, more singular in this whimsical nation, say I to the Athenians, is, that a frolic of yours during the Saturnalia,* when the slaves are served by their masters, is seriously continued by them throughout the whole year, and throughout the whole course of their lives; accompanied too with some circumstances, which still farther augment the absurdity and ridicule. Your sport only elevates for a few days those whom fortune has thrown down, and whom she too, in sport, may really elevate for ever above you: but this nation gravely exalts those whom nature has subjected to them, and whose inferiority and infirmities are absolutely incurable. The women, though without virtue, are their masters and sovereigns: these they reverence, praise, and magnify: to these they pay the highest deference and respect: and in all places and all times, the superiority of the females is readily acknowledged and submitted to by every one who has the least pretensions to education and politeness. Scarce any crime would be so universally detested as an infraction of this rule.

You need go no farther, replied PALAMEDES, I can easily conjecture the people whom you aim at. The strokes, with which you have painted them, are pretty just, and yet you must acknowledge, that scarce any people are to be found, either in ancient or modern times, whose national character is, upon the whole, less liable to exception. But I give you thanks for helping me out with my argument. I had no intention of exalting the moderns at the expence of the ancients. I only meant to represent the uncertainty of all these judgments, concerning characters, and to convince you, that fashion, vogue, custom, and law, were the chief foundation of all moral determinations. The Athenians, surely, were a civilized, intelligent people, if ever there were one; and yet their man of merit might, in this age, be held in horror and execration. The French are also, without doubt a very

* The Greeks kept the feast of Saturn or Chronus, as well as the Romans. Lucian. Epist. Saturn.

civilized, intelligent people, and yet their man of merit might, with the Athenians, be an object of the highest contempt and ridicule, and even hatred And what renders the matter more extraordinary these two people are supposed to be the most similar in their national character of any in ancient and modern times, and while the English flatter themselves that they resemble the Romans, their neighbours on the continent draw the parallel between themselves and those polite Greeks. What wide difference, therefore, in the sentiments of morals, must be found between civilized nations and Barbarians, or between nations whose characters have little in common? How shall we pretend to fix a standard for judgments of this nature?

By tracing matters, replied I, a little higher, and examining the first principles, which each nation establishes, of blame or censure The Rhine flows north, the Rhone south, yet both spring from the *same* mountain, and are also actuated, in their opposite directions, by the *same* principle of gravity The different inclinations of the ground, on which they run, cause all the difference of their courses

In how many circumstances would an Athenian and a Frenchman of merit certainly resemble each other? Good sense, knowledge, wit, eloquence, humanity, fidelity truth, justice, courage, temperance, constancy, dignity of mind these you have all omitted, in order to insist only on the points, in which they may, by accident, differ. Very well I am willing to comply with you, and shall endeavour to account for these differences from the most universal, established principles of morals

The Greek loves, I care not to examine more particularly I shall only observe, that, however blameable, they arose from a very innocent cause, the frequency of the gymnastic exercises among that people; and were recommended, though absurdly, as the source of friendship, sympathy, mutual attachment, and fidelity [Plat symp. p 182.] qualities esteemed in all nations and all ages

The marriage of half-brothers and sisters seems no great difficulty. Love between the nearer relations is contrary to reason and public utility, but the precise point, where we are to stop, can scarcely be determined by natural reason, and is therefore a very proper subject for municipal law or custom If the Athenians went a little too far on the one side, the canon law has surely pushed matters a great way into the other extreme

Had you asked a parent at Athens, why he bereaved his child of that life which he had so lately given it, It is, because I love it, he would reply, and regard the poverty which it must inherit from me, as a greater evil than death, which it is not capable of dreading, feeling, or resenting [Plut. de amore prolis, sub fine.]

How is public liberty, the most valuable of all blessings, to be

recovered from the hands of an usurper or tyrant, if his power shields him from public rebellion, and our scruples from private vengeance? That his crime is capital by law, you acknowledge: and must the highest aggravation of his crime, the putting of himself above law, form his full security? You can reply nothing, but by showing the great inconveniencies of assassination; which could any one have proved clearly to the ancients, he had reformed their sentiments in this particular.

Again, to cast your eye on the picture which I have drawn of modern manners; there is almost as great difficulty, I acknowledge, to justify French as Greek gallantry; except only, that the former is much more natural and agreeable than the latter.

The most inviolable attachment to the laws of our country is every where acknowledged a capital virtue; and where the people are not so happy, as to have any legislature but a single person, the strictest loyalty is, in that case, the truest patriotism.

Nothing surely can be more absurd and barbarous than the practice of duelling; but those who justify it, say that it begets civility and good manners. And a duellist, you may observe, always values himself upon his courage, his sense of honour, his fidelity and friendship; qualities which are here indeed very oddly directed, but which have been esteemed universally, since the foundation of the world.

Have the gods forbid self-murder? An Athenian allows that it ought to be forborn. Has the Deity permitted it? A Frenchman allows, that death is perferable to pain and infamy.

You see then, continued I, that the principles upon which men reason in morals are always the same; though the conclusions which they draw are often very different. That they all reason aright with regard to this subject, more than with regard to any other, it is not incumbent on any moralist to show. It is sufficient, that the original principles of censure or blame are uniform, and that erroneous conclusions can be corrected by sounder reasoning and larger experience. Though many ages have elapsed since the fall of Greece and Rome; though many changes have arrived in religion, language, laws, and customs; none of these revolutions has ever produced any considerable innovation in the primary sentiments of morals, more than in those of external beauty. Some minute differences, perhaps, may be observed in both. Horace* celebrates a low forehead, and Anacreon joined eye-brows†. But the Apollo and the Venus of antiquity are still our models for male and female beauty; in like manner as the character of Scipio continues our standard for the glory of heroes, and that of Cornelia for the honour of matrons.

It appears, that there never was any quality recommended by any

* Epist. lib. I. epist. 7. Also lib. I. ode 3.

† Ode 28. Petronius (cap. 86.) joins both these circumstances as beauties.

one, as a virtue or moral excellence, but on account of its being *useful*, or *agreeable* to a man *himself* or to *others*. For what other reason can ever be assigned for praise or approbation? Or where would be the sense of extolling a *good* character or action, which, at the same time, is allowed to be *good for nothing*! All the differences, therefore, in morals, may be reduced to this one general foundation, and be accounted for by the different views which people take of these circumstances.

Sometimes men differ in their judgment about the usefulness of any habit or action sometimes also the peculiar circumstances of things render one moral quality more useful than others, and give it a peculiar preference.

It is not surprising, that, during a period of war and disorder, the military virtues should be more celebrated than the pacific, and attract more the admiration and attention of mankind 'How 'usual is it,' says Tully, 'to find Cimbrians, Celtiberians, and other 'Barbarians, who bear, with inflexible constancy, all the fatigues and 'dangers of the field, but are immediately dispirited under the pain 'and hazard of a languishing distemper while, on the other hand, 'the Greeks patiently endure the slow approaches of death, when 'armed with sickness and disease, but timorously fly his presence, 'when he attacks them violently with swords and falchions!' [Tusc. Quest. lib ii.] So different is even the same virtue of courage among warlike or peaceful nations! And indeed we may observe, that, as the difference between war and peace is the greatest that arises among nations and public societies, it produces also the greatest variations in moral sentiment, and diversifies the most our ideas of virtue and personal merit.

Sometimes, too, magnanimity, greatness of mind, disdain of slavery, inflexible rigour and integrity, may better suit the circumstances of one age than those of another, and have a more kindly influence, both on public affairs, and on a man's own safety and advancement. Our idea of merit, therefore, will also vary a little with these variations; and Labeo, perhaps, be censured for the same qualities, which procured Cato the highest approbation

A degree of luxury may be ruinous and pernicious in a native of Switzerland, which only fosters the arts, and encourages industry in a Frenchman ro Englishman We are not, therefore, to expect, either the same sentiments, or the same laws in Berne, which prevail in London or Paris

Different customs have also some influence as well as different utilities; and by giving an early bias to the mind, may produce a superior propensity, either to the useful or the agreeable qualities; to those which regard self, or those which extend to society. These four sources of moral sentiment still subsist, but particular accidents

at one time, make any one of them flow with greater abundance than at another.

The customs of some nations shut up the women from all social commerce: those of others make them so essential a part of society and conversation, that, except where business is transacted, the male-sex alone are supposed almost wholly incapable of mutual discourse and entertainment. As this difference is the most material that can happen in private life, it must also produce the greatest variation in our moral sentiments.

Of all nations in the world, where polygamy was not allowed, the Greeks seem to have been the most reserved in their commerce with the fair sex, and to have imposed on them the strictest laws of modesty and decency. We have a strong instance of this in an oration of Lysias. [Orat. 33.] A widow, injured, ruined, undone, calls a meeting of a few of her nearest friends and relations, and though never before accustomed, says the orator, to speak in the presence of men, the distress of her circumstances constrained her to lay the case before them. The very opening of her mouth in such company required, it seems, an apology.

When Demosthenes prosecuted his tutors, to make them refund his patrimony, it became necessary for him, in the course of the law-suit, to prove that the marriage of Aphobus' sister with Oneter was entirely fraudulent, and that, notwithstanding her sham-marriage, she had lived with her brother at Athens for two years past, ever since her divorce from her former husband. And it is remarkable, that though these were people of the first fortune and distinction in the city, the orator could prove this fact no way, but by calling for her female slaves to be put to the question, and by the evidence of one physician, who had seen her in her brother's house during her illness. [In Oneterem.] So reserved were Greek manners.

We may be assured, that an extreme purity of manners was the consequence of this reserve. Accordingly we find, that, except the fabulous stories of an Helen and a Clytemnestra, there scarcely is an instance of any event in the Greek history, which proceeded from the intrigues of women. On the other hand, in modern times, particularly in a neighbouring nation, the females enter into all transactions and all management of church and state: and no man can expect success, who takes not care to obtain their good graces. Hen. III., by incurring the displeasure of the fair, endangered his crown, and lost his life, as much as by his indulgence to heresy.

Some people are inclined to think, that the best way of adjusting all differences, and of keeping the proper medium between the *agreeable* and the *useful* qualities of the sex, is to live with them after the manner of the Romans and the English (for the customs of these two nations seem similar in this respect); that is, without gallan-

try*, and without jealousy. By a parity of reason, the customs of the Spaniards and of the Italians of an age ago (for the present are very different), must be the worst of any, because they favour both gallantry and jealousy

Nor will these different customs of nations affect the one sex only their idea of personal merit in the males must also be somewhat different with regard, at least, to conversation, address, and humour The one nation, where the men live much apart, will naturally more approve of prudence, the other of gaiety With the one, simplicity of manners will be in the highest esteem, with the other, politeness The one will distinguish themselves by good-sense and judgment, the other, by taste and delicacy The eloquence of the former will shine most in the senate, that of the other, on the theatre

These, I say, are the *natural* effects of such customs. For it must be confessed, that chance has a great influence on national manners and many events happen in society, which are not to be accounted for by general rules Who could imagine, for instance, that the Romans, who lived freely with their women, should be very indifferent about music, and esteem dancing infamous while the Greeks, who never almost saw a woman but in their own houses, were continually piping, singing, and dancing?

The differences of moral sentiment, which naturally arise from a republican or monarchical government, are also very obvious, as well as those which proceed from general riches or poverty, union or faction, ignorance or learning I shall conclude this long discourse with observing, that different customs and situations vary not the original ideas of merit (however they may some consequences) in any very essential point, and prevail chiefly with regard to young men, who can aspire to the agreeable qualities, and may attempt to please. The MANNER, the ORNAMENTS, the GRACES, which succeed in this shape, are more arbitrary and casual but the merit of riper years is almost every where the same, and consists chiefly in integrity, humanity, ability, knowledge, and the other more solid and useful qualities of the human mind

What you insist on, replied PALAMEDES, may have some foundation, when you adhere to the maxims of common life and ordinary conduct. Experience and the practice of the world readily correct any great extravagance on either side. But what say you to *artificial* lives and manners? How do you reconcile the maxims, on which, in different ages and nations, these are founded?

What do you understand by *artificial* lives and manners? said I. I explain myself, replied he. You know, that religion had, in ancient

* The gallantry here meant is that of amours and attachments, not that of complaisance, which is as much paid to the fair sex in England as in any other country.

times, very little influence on common life, and that, after men had performed their duty in sacrifices and prayers at the temple, they thought that the gods left the rest of their conduct to themselves, and were little pleased or offended with those virtues or vices which only affected the peace and happiness of human society In those ages, it was the business of philosophy alone to regulate men's ordinary behaviour and deportment, and accordingly, we may observe, that this being the sole principle by which a man could elevate himself above his fellows, it acquired a mighty ascendant over many, and produced great singularities of maxims and of conduct At present, when philosophy has lost the allurement of novelty, it has no such extensive influence, but seems to confine himself mostly to speculations in the closet in the same manner, as the ancient religion was limited to sacrifices in the temple Its place is now supplied by the modern religion, which inspects our whole conduct, and prescribes an universal rule to our actions, to our words, to our very thoughts and inclinations; a rule so much the more austere, as it is guarded by infinite, though distant rewards and punishments, and no infraction of it can ever be concealed or disguised

Diogenes is the most celebrated model of extravagant philosophy Let us seek a parallel to him in modern times We shall not disgrace any philosophic name by a comparison with the DOMINICS or LOYOLAS, or any canonized monk or friar Let us compare him to Pascal, a man of parts and genius, as well as Diogenes himself, and perhaps too a man of virtue, had he allowed his virtuous inclinations to have exerted and displayed themselves.

The foundation of Diogenes' conduct was an endeavour to render himself an independent being as much as possible, and to confine all his wants, and desires, and pleasures, within himself and his own mind the aim of Pascal was to keep a perpetual sense of his dependence before his eyes, and never to forget his numberless wants and infirmities. The ancient supported himself by magnanimity, ostentation, pride, and the idea of his own superiority above his fellow-creatures The modern made constant profession of humility and abasement, of the contempt and hatred of himself, and endeavoured to attain these supposed virtues as far as they are attainable. The austerities of the Greek were in order to inure himself to hardships, and prevent his ever suffering those of the Frenchman were embraced merely for their own sake, and in order to suffer as much as possible The philosopher indulged himself in the most beastly pleasures, even in public the saint refused himself the most innocent, even in private The former thought it his duty to love his friends, and to rail at them, and reprove them, and scold them: the latter endeavoured to be absolutely indifferent towards his nearest relations, and to love and speak well of his enemies. The great object

as

of Diogenes' wit was every kind of superstition, that is, every [illegible] of religion known in his time. The mortality of the soul was his [illegible] principle, and even his sentiments of a Divine Providence seem to have been licentious Superstition directed Pascal's faith and practice; and an extreme contempt of this life, in comparison of the future, was the chief foundation of his conduct

In such a remarkable contrast do these two men stand · yet both of them have met with general admiration in their different ages, and have been proposed as models of imitation Where then is the universal standard of morals, which you talk of? And what rule shall we establish for the many different, nay, contrary sentiments of mankind?

An experiment, said I, which succeeds in the air, will not always succeed in a vacuum When men depart from the maxims of common reason, and affect these *artificial* lives, as you call them, no one can answer for what will please or displease them They are in a different element from the rest of mankind, and the natural principles of their mind play not with the same regularity as if left to themselves, free from the illusions of religious or philosophical enthusiasm.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF RELIGION.

INTRODUCTION

As every inquiry, which regards religion, is of the utmost importance, there are two questions in particular, which challenge our attention, to wit, that concerning its foundation in reason, and that concerning its origin in human nature Happily, the first question, which is the most important, admits of the most obvious, at least, the clearest solution. The whole frame of nature bespeaks an Intelligent Author; and no rational inquirer can, after serious reflection, suspend his belief a moment with regard to the primary principles of genuine Theism and Religion But the other question, concerning the origin of religion in human nature, is exposed to some more difficulty. The belief of invisible, intelligent power, has been very generally diffused over the human race, in all places and in all ages; but it has never perhaps been so universal as to admit of no exceptions, nor has it been, in any degree, uniform in the ideas, which it has [illegible]. Some nations have been discovered, who entertained no [illegible] Religion, if travellers and historians may be credited; and [illegible] nations, and scarce any two men, have ever agreed [illegible]

same sentiments. It would appear, therefore, that this pre-conception springs not from an original instinct or primary impression of nature, such as gives rise to self-love, affection between the sexes, love of progeny, gratitude, resentment, since every instinct of this kind has been found absolutely universal in all nations and ages, and has always a precise determinate object, which it inflexibly pursues. The first religious principles must be secondary, such as may easily be perverted by various accidents and causes, and whose operation, too, in some cases, may, by an extraordinary concurrence of circumstances, be altogether prevented What those principles are, which give rise to the original belief, and what those accidents and causes are which direct its operation, is the subject of our present inquiry

---

SECT. I.—THAT POLYTHESIM WAS THE PRIMARY RELIGION OF MEN

IT appears to me, that, if we consider the improvement of human society, from rude beginnings to a state of greater perfection, polytheism or idolatry was, and necessarily must have been, the first and most ancient religion of mankind This opinion I shall endeavour to confirm by the following arguments

It is a matter of fact incontestible, that about 1700 years ago all mankind were polytheists The doubtful and sceptical principles of a few philosophers, or the theism, and that too not entirely pure, of one or two nations, form no objection worth regarding Behold then the clear testimony of history The farther we mount up into antiquity, the more do we find mankind plunged into polytheism. No marks, no symptoms of any more perfect religion The most ancient records of the human race still present us with that system as the popular and established creed. The north, the south, the east, the west, give their unanimous testimony to the same fact. What can be opposed to so full an evidence?

As far as writing or history reaches, mankind, in ancient times, appear universally to have been polytheists. Shall we assert, that, in more ancient times, before the knowledge of letters, or the discovery of any art or science, men entertained the principles of pure theism? That is, while they were ignorant and barbarous, they discovered truth: but fell into error, as soon as they acquired learning and politeness.

But in this assertion you not only contradict all appearance of probability, but also our present experience concerning the principles and opinions of barbarous nations. The savage tribes of America, Africa, and Asia, are all idolaters. Not a single exception to this rule. Insomuch, that, were a traveller to transport himself into any

unknown region; if he found inhabitants who cultivated arts and science, though even upon that supposition there are odds against their being theists, yet could he not safely, till farther inquiry, pronounce any thing on that head: but if he found them ignorant and barbarous, he might beforehand declare them idolaters; and there scarcely is a possibility of his being mistaken.

It seems certain, that, according to the natural progress of human thought, the ignorant multitude must first entertain some grovelling and familiar notion of superior powers, before they stretch their conception to that perfect Being, who bestowed order on the whole frame of nature. We may as reasonably imagine, that men inhabited palaces before huts and cottages, or studied geometry before agriculture; as assert that the Deity appeared to them a pure spirit, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent, before he was apprehended to be a powerful, though limited being, with human passions and appetites, limbs and organs. The mind rises gradually, from inferior to superior: by abstracting from what is imperfect, it forms an idea of perfection: and slowly distinguishing the nobler parts of its own frame from the grosser, it learns to transfer only the former, much elevated and refined, to its divinity. Nothing could disturb this natural progress of thought, but some obvious and invincible argument, which might immediately lead the mind into the pure principles of theism, and make it overleap, at one bound, the vast interval which is interposed between the human and the divine nature. But though I allow, that the order and frame of the universe, when accurately examined, affords such an argument; yet I can never think, that this consideration could have an influence on mankind, when they formed their first rude notions of religion.

The causes of such objects, as are quite familiar to us, never strike our attention and curiosity; and however extraordinary or surprising these objects in themselves, they are passed over, by the raw and ignorant multitude, without much examination or inquiry. Adam rising at once, in Paradise, and in the full perfection of his faculties, would naturally, as represented by Milton, be astonished at the glorious appearances of nature, the heavens, the air, the earth, his own organs and members; and would be led to ask, whence this wonderful scene arose? but a barbarous, necessitous animal (such as a man is on the first origin of society), pressed by such numerous wants and passions, has no leisure to admire the regular face of nature, or make inquiries concerning the cause of those objects, to which, from his infancy, he has been gradually accustomed. On the contrary, the more regular and uniform, that is, the more perfect nature appears, the more is he familiarized to it, and the less inclined to scrutinize and examine it. A monstous birth excites his curiosity, and is deemed a prodigy. It alarms him from its novelty; and

immediately sets him a trembling, and sacrificing, and praying. But an animal, complete in all its limbs and organs, is to him an ordinary spectacle, and produces no religious opinion or affection. Ask him, whence that animal arose? he will tell you, from the copulation of its parents And these, whence? From the copulation of theirs. A few removes satisfy his curiosity, and set the objects at such a distance, that he entirely loses sight of them Imagine not, that he will so much as start the question, whence the first animal, much less, whence the whole system or united fabric of the universe arose. Or, if you start such a question to him, expect not that he will employ his mind with any anxiety about a subject, so remote, so uninteresting, and which so much exceeds the bounds of his capacity

But farther, if men were at first led into the belief of one superior Being, by reasoning from the frame of nature, they could never possibly leave that belief, in order to embrace polytheism, but the same principles of reason, which at first produced and diffused over mankind, so magnificent an opinion, must be able, with greater facility, to preserve it The first invention and proof of any doctrine is much more difficult than the supporting and retaining of it

There is a great difference between historical facts and speculative opinions, nor is the knowledge of the one propagated in the same manner with that of the other An historical fact, while it passes by oral tradition from eye witnesses and contemporaries, is disguised in every successive narration, and may at last retain but very small, if any, resemblance of the original truth on which it was founded. The frail memories of men, their love of exaggeration, their supine carelessness, these principles, if not corrected by books and writing, soon pervert the account of historical events, where argument or reasoning has little or no place, nor can ever recal the truth, which has once escaped those narrations It is thus the fables of Hercules, Theseus, Bacchus, are supposed to have been originally founded in true history, corrupted by tradition. But with regard to speculative opinions, the case is far otherwise. If these opinions be founded on arguments so clear and obvious as to carry conviction with the generality of mankind, the same arguments, which at first diffused the opinions, will still preserve them in their original purity. If the arguments be more abstruse, and more remote from vulgar apprehension, the opinions will always be confined to a few persons; and as soon as men leave the contemplation of the arguments, the opinions will immediately be lost and be buried in oblivion. Whichever side of this dilemma we take, it must appear impossible, that theism could, from reasoning, have been the primary religion of the human race, and have afterwards, by its corruption, given birth to polytheism, and to all the various superstitions of the heathen world. Reason, when obvious, prevents these corruptions;

when abstruse, it keeps the principles entirely from the knowledge of the vulgar, who are alone liable to corrupt any principle or opinion.

SECTION II.—ORIGIN OF POLYTHEISM.

If we would, therefore, indulge our curiosity, in inquiring concerning the origin of religion, we must turn our thoughts towards polytheism, the primitive religion of uninstructed mankind

Were men led into the apprehension of invisible, intelligent power, by a contemplation of the works of nature, they could never possibly entertain any conception but of one single being, who bestowed existence and order on this vast machine, and adjusted all its parts, according to one regular plan or connected system For though to persons of a certain turn of mind, it may not appear altogether absurd, that several independent beings, endowed with superior wisdom, might conspire in the contrivance and execution of one regular plan; yet is this a merely arbitrary supposition, which, even if allowed possible, must be confessed neither to be supported by probability nor necessity All things in the universe are evidently of a piece. Every thing is adjusted to every thing One design prevails throughout the whole And this uniformity leads the mind to acknowledge one author, because the conception of different authors, without any distinction of attributes or operations, serves only to give perplexity to the imagination, without bestowing any satisfaction on the understanding The statue of LAOCOON, as we learn from Pliny, was the work of three artists but it is certain, that, were we not told so, we should never have imagined, that a groupe of figures, cut from one stone, and united in one plan, was not the work and contrivance of one statuary. To ascribe any single effect to the combination of several causes, is not surely a natural and obvious supposition.

On the other hand, if, leaving the works of nature, we trace the footsteps of Invisible Power in the various and contrary events of human life, we are necessarily led into polytheism and to the acknowledgment of several limited and imperfect deities. Storms and tempests ruin what is nourished by the sun. The sun destroys what is fostered by the moisture of dews and rains. War may be favourable to a nation, whom the inclemency of the seasons afflicts with famine. Sickness and pestilence may depopulate a kingdom, amidst the most profuse plenty The same nation is not, at the same time, equally successful by sea and by land. And a nation, which now triumphs over its enemies, may anon submit to their more prosperous arms. In short, the conduct of events, or what we call the plan of a particular Providence, is so full of variety and uncertainty, that

suppose it immediately ordered by any intelligent beings, we must acknowledge a contrariety in their designs and intentions, a constant combat of opposite powers, and a repentance or change of intention in the same power, from impotence or levity Each nation has its tutelar deity Each element is subjected to its invisible power or agent. The province of each god is separate from that of another Nor are the operations of the same god always certain and invariable. To-day he protects to-morrow he abandons us. Prayers and sacrifices, rites and ceremonies, well or ill performed, are the sources of his favour or enmity, and produce all the good or ill fortune, which are to be found amongst mankind

We may conclude, therefore, that, in all nations, which have embraced polytheism, the first ideas of religion arose, not from a contemplation of the works of nature, but from a concern with regard to the events of life, and from the incessant hopes and fears, which actuate the human mind. Accordingly we find, that all idolaters, having separated the provinces of their deities, have recourse to that invisible agent, to whose authority they are immediately subjected, and whose province it is to superintend that course of actions, in which they are, at any time, engaged Juno is invoked at marriages, Lucina at births. Neptune receives the prayers of seamen, and Mars of warriors, The husbandman cultivates his field under the protection of Ceres; and the merchant acknowledges the authority of Mercury Each natural event is supposed to be governed by some intelligent agent, and nothing prosperous or adverse can happen in life, which may not be the subject of peculiar prayers or thanksgivings *

It must necessarily, indeed, be allowed, that, in order to carry men's attention beyond the present course of things, or lead them into any inference concerning invisible intelligent power, they must be actuated by some passion which prompts their thought and reflection, some motive which urges their first inquiry But what passion shall we here have recourse to, for explaining an effect of such mighty consequence? Not speculative curiosity, surely, or the pure love of truth. That motive is too refined for such gross apprehensions, and would lead them into inquiries concerning the frame of nature, a subject too large and comprehensive for their narrow capacities. No passions, therefore, can be supposed to work upon such barbarians, but the ordinary affections of human life, the anxious concern for happiness, the dread of future misery, the terror of death, the thirst of revenge, the appetite for food and other necessaries. Agitated by hopes and fears of this nature, especially the latter, men scrutinize, with a trembling curiosity,

* 'Fragilis et laboriosa mortalitas in partes ista digessit, infirmitatis suae memor, ut portionibus quisquis coleret, quo maxime indigeret.' Plin. lib. ii. cap. 7. So early as Hesiod's [illegible] were [illegible] deities. *Oper. et Dier.* lib. i. ver. 250. But the task to be performed [illegible] still too great for their number. The provinces of the deities were so [illegible] that there was even a god of *Sneezing*. *Arist. Probl.* sect. 33. cap. 7.

the course of future causes, and examine the various and contrary events of human life. And in this disordered scene, with eyes still more disordered and astonished, they see the first obscure traces of divinity.

SECTION II.—THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

We are placed in this world, as in a great theatre, where the true springs and causes of every event are entirely concealed from us; nor have we either sufficient wisdom to foresee, or power to prevent those ills, with which we are continually threatened. We hang in perpetual suspense between life and death, health and sickness, plenty and want; which are distributed amongst the human species by secret and unknown causes, whose operation is oft unexpected, and always unaccountable. These *unknown causes*, then, become the constant object of our hope and fear; and while the passions are kept in perpetual alarm by an anxious expectation of the events, the imagination is equally employed in forming ideas of those powers, on which we have so entire a dependence. Could men anatomize nature, according to the most probable, at least the most intelligible philosophy, they would find that these causes are nothing but the particular fabric and structure of the minute parts of their own bodies and of external objects; and that, by a regular and constant machinery, all the events are produced, about which they are so much concerned. But this philosophy exceeds the comprehension of the ignorant multitude, who can only conceive the *unknown causes*, in a general and confused manner; though their imagination, perpetually employed on the same subject, must labour to form some particular and distinct idea of them. The more they consider these causes themselves, and the uncertainty of their operation, the less satisfaction do they meet with in their researches; and, however unwilling, they must at last have abandoned so arduous an attempt, were it not for a propensity in human nature, which leads into a system, that gives them some satisfaction.

There is an universal tendency among mankind to conceive all beings like themselves, and to transfer to every object those qualities with which they are familiarly acquainted, and of which they are intimately conscious. We find human faces in the moon, armies in the clouds; and, by a natural propensity, if not corrected by experience and reflection, ascribe malice or good will to every thing that hurts or pleases us. Hence the frequency and beauty of the *prosopopœia* in poetry; where trees, mountains, and streams, are personified, and the inanimate parts of nature acquire sentiment and passion. And though these poetical figures and expressions gain not on the belief, they may serve, at least, to prove a certain tendency in the imagination, without

which they could neither be beautiful nor natural. Nor is a river-god or hamadryad always taken for a mere poetical or imaginary personage; but may sometimes enter into the real creed of the ignorant vulgar, while each grove or field is represented as possessed of a particular *genius* or invisible power, which inhabits and protects it. Nay, philosophers cannot entirely exempt themselves from this natural frailty; but have oft ascribed to inanimate matter the horror of a *vacuum*, sympathies, antipathies, and other affections of human nature. The absurdity is not less, while we cast our eyes upwards, and, transferring, as is too usual, human passions and infirmities to the Deity, represent him as jealous and revengeful, capricious and partial, and, in short, a wicked and foolish man in every respect, but his superior power and authority. No wonder, then, that mankind, being placed in such an absolute ignorance of causes, and being at the same time so anxious concerning their future fortune, should immediately acknowledge a dependence on invisible powers, possessed of sentiment and intelligence. The *unknown causes*, which continually employ their thought, appearing always in the same aspect, are all apprehended to be of the same kind or species. Nor is it long before we ascribe to them thought, and reason, and passion, and sometimes even the limbs and figures of men, in order to bring them nearer to a resemblance with ourselves.

In proportion as any man's course of life is governed by accident, we always find that he increases in superstition; as may particularly be observed of gamesters and sailors, who, though, of all mankind, the least capable of serious reflection, abound most in frivolous and superstitious apprehensions. The gods, says Coriolanus in Dionysius, [Lib. viii.] have an influence in every affair; but above all in war, where the event is so uncertain. All human life, especially before the institution of order and good government, being subject to fortuitous accidents; it is natural that superstition should prevail every where in barbarous ages, and put men on the most earnest inquiry concerning those invisible powers, who dispose of their happiness or misery. Ignorant of astronomy and the anatomy of plants and animals, and too little curious to observe the admirable adjustment of final causes, they remain still unacquainted with a first and supreme Creator, and with that infinitely Perfect Spirit, who alone, by his Almighty will, bestowed order on the whole frame of nature. Such a magnificent idea is too big for their narrow conceptions, which can neither observe the beauty of the work, nor comprehend the grandeur of its author. They suppose their deities, however potent and invisible, to be nothing but a species of human creatures, perhaps raised from among mankind, and retaining all human passions and appetites, together with corporeal limbs and organs. Such limited beings, though masters of human fate, being each of them incapable of extending his influence every-

where, must be vastly multiplied, in order to answer that variety of events which happen over the whole face of nature Thus every place is stored with a crowd of local deities, and thus polytheism has prevailed, and still prevails, among the greatest part of uninstructed mankind.*

Any of the human affections may lead us into the notion of invisible, intelligent power, hope as well as fear, gratitude as well as affliction: but if we examine our own hearts, or observe what passes around us, we shall find, that men are much oftener thrown on their knees by the melancholy than by the agreeable passions Prosperity is easily received as our due, and few questions are asked concerning its cause or author It begets cheerfulness, and activity, and alacrity, and a lively enjoyment of every social and sensual pleasure and during this state of mind, men have little leisure or inclination to think of the unknown invisible regions On the other hand, every disastrous accident alarms us, and sets us on inquiries concerning the principles whence it arose apprehensions spring up with regard to futurity. and the mind, sunk into diffidence, terror, and melancholy, has recourse to every method of appeasing those secret intelligent powers, on whom our fortune is supposed entirely to depend

No topic is more useful with all popular divines than to display the advantages of affliction, in bringing men to a due sense of religion, by subduing their confidence and sensuality, which, in times of prosperity make them forgetful of a Divine Providence Nor is this topic confined merely to modern religion The ancients have also employed it 'Fortune has never liberally without envy,' says a Greek historian, 'bestowed an unmixed happiness on mankind, but with all her gifts has ever conjoined some disastrous circumstance, in order to chastise men into a reverence for the gods, whom, in a continued course of prosperity, they are apt to neglect and forget. [Diodorus Siculus lib iii]

What age or period of life is the most addicted to superstition? The weakest and most timid What sex? The same answer must be given 'The leaders and examples of every kind of superstition,' says Strabo, [Lib vii] are the women These excite the men to devotion and supplications, and the observance of religious days. It is rare to meet with one that lives apart from the females, and yet is addicted to such practices And nothing can, for this reason, be

* The following lines of Euripides are so much to the present purpose, that I cannot forbear quoting them.

Ουκ εστιν ουδεν πιστον, ουτ' ευδοξια,
Ουτ' αυ καλως πρασσοντα μη πραξειν κακως.
Φυρουσι δ' αυθ' οἱ θεοι παλιν τε και προσω,
Ταραγμον εντιθεντες, ὡς αγνωσια
Σεβωμεν αυτους.
Hecuba.

'There is nothing secure in the world; no glory, no prosperity. The gods toss all life into 'confusion; mix every thing with its reverse, that all of us, from our ignorance and 'uncertainty, may pay them the more worship and reverence.'

more improbable, than the account given of an order of men among the Getes, who practised celibacy, and were, notwithstanding, the most religious fanatics.' A method of reasoning which would lead us to entertain a bad idea of the devotion of monks, did we not know by an experience, not so common, perhaps in Strabo's days, that one may practice celibacy, and profess chastity, and yet maintain the closest connections and most entire sympathy with that timorous and pious sex.

SECT. IV.—DEITIES NOT CONSIDERED AS CREATORS OR FORMERS OF THE WORLD

THE only point of theology, in which we shall find a consent of mankind almost universal, is, that there is invisible, intelligent power in the world but whether this power be supreme or subordinate, whether confined to one being, or distributed among several, what attributes, qualities, connections, or principles of action ought to be ascribed to those beings, concerning all these points, there is the wildest difference in the popular systems of theology Our ancestors in Europe, before the revival of letters, believed, as we do at present, that there was one supreme God, the author of nature, whose power, though in itself uncontrollable, was yet often exerted by the interposition of his angels and subordinate ministers, who executed his sacred purposes. But they also believed, that all nature was full of other invisible powers, fairies, goblins, elves, sprights, beings, stronger and mightier than men, but much inferior to the celestial natures, who surround the throne of God Now suppose, that any one, in those ages, had denied the existence of God and of his angels, would not his impiety justly have deserved the appellation of atheism, even though he had still allowed, by some odd capricious reasoning, that the popular stories of elves and fairies were just and well grounded? The difference, on the one hand, between such a person and a genuine theist is infinitely greater than that, on the other, between him and one that absolutely excludes all invisible intelligent power And it is a fallacy, merely from the casual resemblance of names, without any conformity of meaning, to rank such opposite opinions under the same denomination.

To any one, who considers justly of the matter, it will appear, that the gods of all polytheists are no better than the elves or fairies of our ancestors, and merit as little any pious worship or veneration. These pretended religionists are really a kind of superstitious atheists, and acknowledge no being, that corresponds to our idea of a deity. No first principle of mind or thought: no supreme government and ad-

ministration; no divine contrivance or intention in the fabric of the world.

The Chinese, when [Pere le compte] their prayers are not answered, beat their idols. The deities of the Laplanders are any large stone which they meet with of an extraordinary shape.* The Egyptian mythologists, in order to account for animal worship, said, that the gods, pursued by the violence of earth-born men, who were their enemies, had formerly been obliged to disguise themselves under the semblance of beasts.† The Caunii, a nation in the Lesser Asia, resolved to admit no strange gods among them, regularly, at certain seasons, assemble themselves completely armed, beat the air with their lances, and proceed in that manner to their frontiers; in order, as they said, to expel the foreign deities. [Herodot. lib.] *Not even the immortal gods*, said some German nations to Cæsar, *are a match for the Suevi.*‡

Many ills, says Dione in Homer, to Venus, wounded by Diomede, many ills, my daughter, have the gods inflicted on men: and many ills, in return, have men inflicted on the gods. [Lib. ix. 382.] We need but open any classic author to meet with these gross representations of the deities; and Longinus [cap. ix.] with reason observes, that such ideas of the divine nature, if literally taken, contain a true atheism.

Some writers§ have been surprised, that the impieties of Aristophanes, should have been tolerated, nay publicly acted and applauded by the Athenians; a people so superstitious and so jealous of the public religion, that, at that very time, they put Socrates to death for his imagined incredulity. But these writers do not consider, that the ludicrous, familiar images, under which the gods are represented by that comic poet, instead of appearing impious, were the genuine lights in which the ancients conceived their divinities. What conduct can be more criminal or mean, than that of Jupiter in the Amphitrion? Yet that play, which represented his gallant exploits, was supposed so agreeable to him, that it was always acted in Rome by public authority, when the state was threatened with pestilence, famine, or any general calamity. [Arnob. lib. vii.]

The Lacedemonians, says Xenophon, [De Laced. Rep.] always, during war, put up their petitions very early in the morning, in order to be beforehand with their enemies, and, by being the first solicitors, pre-engage the gods in their favour. We may gather from Seneca, [Epist. xli.] that it was usual, for the votaries in the temples, to make interest with the beadle or sexton, that they might have a seat near the

* Regnard, Voiage de Laponie.

† Diod. Sic. lib. i. Lucian. de Sacrif. Ovid alludes to the tradition, Metam. lib. v. 321. Manilius, lib. iv.

‡ Cæs. Comment. de bello Gallico, lib. iv.

§ Pere Brumoy, Theatre des Grecs: & Fontenelle, Histoire des Oracles.

image of the deity, in order to be the best heard in their prayers and applications to him. The Tyrians, when besieged by Alexander, threw chains on the statue of Hercules, to prevent that deity from deserting to the enemy.* Augustus, having twice lost his fleet by storms, forbad Neptune to be carried in procession along with the other gods, and fancied, that he had sufficiently revenged himself by that expedient [Suet in vita Aug cap 16] After Germanicus' death, the people were so enraged at their gods, that they stoned them in their temples, and openly renounced all allegiance to them [Id in vita Cal. cap. 5.]

To ascribe the origin and fabric of the universe to these imperfect beings never enters into the imagination of any polytheist or idolater Hesiod, whose writings, with those of Homer, contained the canonical system of the heathen, † Hesiod, I say, supposes gods and men to have sprung equally from the unknown powers of nature ‡ And throughout the whole theogony of that author, Pandora is the only instance of creation, or a voluntary production, and she too was formed by the gods merely from despight to Prometheus, who had furnished men with stolen fire from the celestial regions [Theog l. 570] The ancient mythologists, indeed, seem throughout to have rather embraced the idea of generation than that of creation or formation, and to have thence accounted for the origin of this universe

Ovid, who lived in a learned age, and had been instructed by philosophers in the principles of a divine creation or formation of the world, finding, that such an idea would not agree with the popular mythology, which he delivers, leaves it, in a manner, loose and detached from his system *Quisquis fuit ille Deorum?* [Metamph. lib. 1 l. 32] Whichever of the gods it was, says he, that dissipated the chaos, and introduced order into the universe it could neither be Saturn, he knew, nor Jupiter, nor Neptune, nor any of the received deities of paganism His theological system had taught him nothing upon that head, and he leaves the matter equally undetermined.

Diodorus Siculus [Lib 1] beginning his work with an enumeration of the most reasonable opinions concerning the origin of the world, makes no mention of a deity or intelligent mind, though it is evident from his history, that he was much more prone to superstition than to irreligion. And in another passage [Id. ibid.] talking of the Ichthyophagi, a nation in India, he says, that, there being so great difficulty in accounting for their descent we must conclude them to be *aborigines*, without any beginning of their generation, propagating their race from all eternity, as some of the physiologers, in treating of the origin of nature, have justly observed. 'But in such objects as these,' adds the historian, 'which exceed all human capacity; it may well

* Quint. Curtius, lib. iv cap 3. Diod. Sic. lib xvii.
† Herodot. lib. ii. Lucian. *Jupiter confutatus, de luctu, Saturn, &c.*
‡ Ὡς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ θνητοί τ' ἄνθρωποι. Hes. Opera & Dies, l. 108.

happen, that those, who discourse the most, know the least; giving a specious appearance of truth in their reasonings, while extremely wide of the real truth and matter of fact.'

A strange sentiment in our eyes, to be embraced by a professed and zealous religionist !* But it was merely by accident, that the question concerning the origin of the world did ever in ancient times enter into religious systems, or was treated of by theologers. The philosophers alone made profession of delivering systems of this kind; and it was pretty late too before these bethought themselves of having recourse to a mind or supreme intelligence, as the first cause of all. So far was it from being esteemed profane in those days to account for the origin of things without a deity, that Thales, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, and others, who embraced that system of cosmogony, past unquestioned; while Anaxagoras, the first undoubted theist among the philosophers, was perhaps the first that ever was accused of atheism.†

We are told by Sextus Empiricus [Adversus Mathem. lib. ix.] that Epicurus, when a boy, reading with his preceptor these verses of Hesiod,

> Eldest of beings, *chaos* first arose;
> Next *earth*, wide-stretch'd, the *seat* of all:

The young scholar first betrayed his inquisitive genius, by asking, *And chaos whence?* But was told by his preceptor, that he must have recourse to the philosophers for a solution of such questions. And from this hint Epicurus left philology and all other studies, in order to betake himself to that science, whence alone he expected satisfaction with regard to these sublime subjects.

The common people were never likely to push their researches so far, or derive from reasoning their systems of religion; when philologers and mythologists, we see, scarcely ever discovered so much penetration. And even the philosophers, who discoursed of such topics, readily assented to the grossest theory, and admitted the joint origin of gods and men from night and chaos; from fire, water, air, or whatever they established to be the ruling element.

* The same author, who can thus account for the origin of the world without a Deity, esteems it impious to explain from physical causes the common accidents of life, earthquakes, inundations, and tempests; and devoutly ascribes these to the anger of Jupiter or Neptune. A plain proof, whence he derived his ideas of religion. Lib. xv. p. 364. Edit. Rhodomanni.

† It will be easy to give a reason, why Thales, Anaximander, and those early philosophers, who really were atheists, might be very orthodox in the Pagan creed; and why Anaxagoras and Socrates, though real theists, must naturally, in ancient times, be esteemed impious. The blind unguided powers of nature, if they could produce men, might also produce such beings as Jupiter and Neptune, who being the most powerful intelligent existences in the world, would be proper objects of worship. But where a Supreme Intelligence, the First Cause of all, is admitted, these capricious beings, if they exist at all, must appear very subordinate and dependent, and consequently be excluded from the rank of deities. Plato (de leg. lib. x.) assigns this reason for the imputation thrown on Anaxagoras, namely his denying the divinity of the stars, planets, and other created objects.

Nor was it only on their first origin, that the gods were supposed dependent on the powers of nature—Throughout the whole period of their existence they were subjected to the dominion of fate or destiny *Think of the force of necessity*, says Agrippa to the Roman people, *that force, to which even the gods must submit* [Dionys. Halic. lib. vi] And the Younger Pliny, [Epist lib vi] agreeable to this way of thinking, tells us, that amidst the darkness, horror, and confusion, which ensued upon the first eruption of Vesuvius, several concluded that all nature was going to wreck, and that gods and men were perishing in one common ruin

It is a great complaisance, indeed, if we dignify with the name of religion such an imperfect system of theology, and put it on a level with later systems, which are founded on principles more just and more sublime For my part, I can scarcely allow the principles even of Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch, and some other *Stoics* and *Academics*, though much more refined than the pagan superstition, to be worthy of the honourable appellation of theism For if the mythology of the heathens resemble the ancient European system of spiritual beings, excluding God and angels and leaving only fairies and sprits, the creed of these philosophers may justly be said to exclude a Deity, and to leave only angels and fairies.

SECTION V—VARIOUS FORMS OF POLYTHEISM ALLEGORY, HERO-WORSHIP

BUT it is chiefly our present business to consider the gross polytheism of the vulgar, and to trace all its various appearances, in the principles of human nature, whence they are derived

Whoever learns by argument the existence of invisible intelligent power, must reason from the admirable contrivance of natural objects, and must suppose the world to be the workmanship of that Divine Being, the original cause of all things But the vulgar polytheist, so far from admitting that idea, deifies every part of the universe, and conceives all the conspicuous productions of nature, to be themselves so many real divinities The sun, moon and stars, are all gods according to his system fountains are inhabited by nymphs, and trees by hamadryads. even monkies, dogs, cats, and other animals, often become sacred in his eyes, and strike him with a religious veneration. And thus, however strong men's propensity to believe invisible, intelligent power in nature, their propensity is equally strong to rest their attention on sensible, visible objects; and in order to reconcile these opposite inclinations, they are led to unite the invisible power with some visible object.

The distribution also of distinct provinces to the several deities is apt to cause some allegory, both physical and moral, to enter into the vulgar systems of polytheism The god of war will naturally be represented as furious, cruel, and impetuous the god of poetry as elegant, polite, and amiable the god of merchandize, especially in early times, as thievish and deceitful The allegories, supposed in Homer and other mythologists, I allow, have often been so strained, that men of sense are apt entirely to reject them, and to consider them as the production merely of the fancy and conceit of critics and commentators But that allegory really has place in the heathen mythology is undeniable, even on the least reflection CUPID the son of Venus, the MUSES the daughters of memory, PROMETHEUS the wise brother, and EPIMETHEUS the foolish, HYGIEIA, or the goddess of health, descended from ESCULAPIUS, or the god of physic who sees not, in these, and in many other instances, the plain traces of allegory? When a god is supposed to preside over any passion, event, or system of actions, it is almost unavoidable to give him a genealogy, attributes, and adventures, suitable to his supposed powers and influence and to carry on that similitude and comparison, which is naturally so agreeable to the mind of man

Allegories, indeed, entirely perfect, we ought not to expect as the productions of ignorance and superstition; there being no work of genius that requires a nicer hand, or has been more rarely executed with success That *Fear* and *Terror* are the sons of MARS is just, by why by Venus? [Hesiod, Theog 1 935] That *Harmony* is the daughter of VENUS is regular, but why by MARS? [Id ibid & Plut. in vita Pelop] That *sleep* is the brother of *Death* is suitable, but why describe him as enamoured of one of the GRACES? [Iliad, xiv 267] And since the ancient mythologists fall into mistakes so gross and palpable, we have no reason surely to expect such refined and long-spun allegories, as some have endeavoured to deduce from their fictions.

Lucretius was plainly seduced by the strong appearance of allegory, which is observable in the pagan fictions He first addresses himself to Venus, as to that generating power, which animates, renews, and beautifies the universe but is soon betrayed by the mythology into incoherences, while he prays to that allegorical personage to appease the furies of her lover Mars an idea not drawn from allegory, but from the popular religion, and which Lucretius, as an Epicurean, could not consistently admit of

The deities of the vulgar are so little superior to human creatures, that, where men are affected with strong sentiments of veneration or gratitude for any hero or public benefactor, nothing can be more natural than to convert him into a god, and fill the heavens, after this manner, with continual recruits from among mankind. Most of the

divinities of the ancient world are supposed to have once been men, and to have been beholden for their *apotheosis* to the admiration and affection of the people The real history of their adventures, corrupted by tradition, and elevated by the marvellous, became a plentiful source of fable, especially in passing through the hands of poets, allegorists, and priests, who successively improved upon the wonder and astonishment of the ignorant multitude

Painters too, and sculptors, came in for their share of profit in the sacred mysteries, and furnishing men with sensible representations of their divinities, whom they clothed in human figures, gave great increase to the public devotion, and determined its object It was probably for want of these arts in rude and barbarous ages, that men deified plants, animals, and even brute, unorganized matter, and rather than be without a sensible object of worship, affixed divinity to such ungainly forms Could any statuary of Syria, in early times, have formed a just figure of Apollo, the conic stone, HELIOGABALUS, had never become the object of such profound adoration, and been received as a representation of the solar deity *

Stilpo was banished by the council of Areopagus, for affirming that the Minerva in the citadel was no divinity? but the workmanship of Phidias, the sculptor [Diod Laert. lib ii] What degree of reason must we expect in the religious belief of the vulgar in other nations when Athenians and Areopagites could entertain such gross conceptions?

These, then, are the general principles of polytheism, founded in human nature, and little or nothing dependent on caprice and accident. As the *causes*, which bestow happiness or misery, are, in general, very little known and very uncertain, our anxious concern endeavours to attain a determinate idea of them, and finds no better expedient than to represent them as intelligent voluntary agents, like ourselves, only somewhat superior in power and wisdom The limited influence of these agents, and their great proximity to human weakness, introduce the various distribution and division of their authority, and thereby give rise to allegory The same principles naturally deify mortals, superior in power, courage, or understanding, and produce hero-worship; together with fabulous history and mythological tradition, in all its wild and unaccountable forms And as an invisible spiritual intelligence is an object too refined for vulgar apprehension, men naturally affix it to some sensible representation, such as either the more conspicuous parts of nature, or the statues, images, and pictures, which a more refined age forms of its divinities

Almost all idolaters, of whatever age or country, concur in these

* Herodian, lib. v. Jupiter Ammon is represented by Curtius as a deity of the same kind, [illegible] The Arabians and Pessinuntians adored also shapeless unformed stones as [illegible] Arnob. lib. vi. So much did their folly exceed that of the Egyptians.

general principles and conceptions, and even the particular characters and provinces, which they assign to their deities, are not extremely different.* The Greek and Roman travellers and conquerors, without difficulty, found their own deities everywhere, and said, This is MERCURY, that VENUS, this MARS, that NEPTUNE; by whatever title the strange gods might be denominated. The goddess HERTHA, of our Saxon ancestors seems to be no other, according to Tacitus, [De Moribus Germ.] than the *Mater Tellus* of the Romans; and his conjecture was evidently just.

SECT. VI.—ORIGIN OF THEISM AND POLYTHEISM.

THE doctrine of one Supreme Deity, the author of nature, is very ancient, has spread itself over great and populous nations, and among them has been embraced by all ranks and conditions of men; but whoever thinks that it has owed its success to the prevalent force of those invincible reasons, on which it is undoubtedly founded, would show himself little acquainted with the ignorance and stupidity of the people, and their incurable prejudices in favour of their particular superstitions. Even at this day, and in Europe, ask any of the vulgar, why he believes in an Omnipotent Creator of the world, he will never mention the beauty of final causes, of which he is wholly ignorant: he will not hold out his hand, and bid you contemplate the suppleness and variety of joints in his fingers, their bending all one way, the counterpoise which they receive from the thumb, the softness and fleshy parts of the inside of his hand, with all the other circumstances which render that member fit for the use to which it was destined. To these he has been long accustomed, and he beholds them with listlessness and unconcern. He will tell you of the sudden and unexpected death of such-a-one, the fall and bruise of such another, the excessive drought of this season, the cold and rains of another. These he ascribes to the immediate operation of Providence: and such events, as, with good reasoners, are the chief difficulties in admitting a Supreme Intelligence, are with him the sole arguments for it.

Many theists, even the most zealous and refined, have denied a *particular* Providence, and have asserted, that the Sovereign Mind, or first principle of all things, having fixed general laws, by which nature is governed, gives free and uninterrupted course to these laws, and disturbs not, at every turn, the settled order of events by particular volitions. From the beautiful connection, say they, and rigid observance of established rules, we draw the chief argument for theism; and from the same principles are enabled to answer the principal

* Cæsar, on the religion of the Gauls, de Bello Gallico, lib. vi.

objections against it. But so little is this understood by the generality of mankind, that, wherever they observe any one to ascribe all events to natural causes, and to remove the particular interposition of a deity, they are apt to suspect him of the grossest infidelity. *A little philosophy*, says Lord Bacon, *makes men atheists. a great deal reconciles them to religion* For men, being taught, by superstitious prejudices, to lay the stress on a wrong place, when that fails them, and they discover, by a little reflection, that the course of nature is regular and uniform, their whole faith totters, and falls to ruin. But being taught, by more reflection, that this very regularity and uniformity is the strongest proof of design and of a Supreme intelligence, they return to that belief which they had deserted, and they are now able to establish it on a firmer and more durable foundation.

Convulsions in nature, disorders, prodigies, miracles, though the most opposite to the plan of a wise superintendent, impress mankind with the strongest sentiments of religion, the causes of events seeming then the most unknown and unaccountable Madness, fury, rage, and an inflamed imagination, though they sink men nearest to the level of the beasts, are, for a like reason, often supposed to be the only dispositions in which we can have any immediate communication with the Deity.

We may conclude, therefore, upon the whole, that, since the vulgar, in nations which have embraced the doctrine of theism, still build it upon irrational and superstitious principles, they are never led into that opinion by any process of argument, but by a certain train of thinking, more suitable to their genius and capacity

It may readily happen, in an idolatrous nation, that though men admit the existence of several limited deities, yet there is some one God, whom, in a particular manner, they make the object of their worship and adoration They may either suppose, that, in the distribution of power and territory among the gods, their nation was subjected to the jurisdiction of that particular deity; or, reducing heavenly objects to the model of things below, they may represent one god as the prince or supreme magistrate of the rest, who, though of the same nature, rules them with an authority, like that which an earthly sovereign exercises over his subjects and vassals. Whether this god, therefore, be considered as their peculiar patron, or as the general sovereign of heaven, his votaries will endeavour, by every art, to insinuate themselves into his favour, and supposing him to be pleased, like themselves, with praise and flattery, there is no eulogy or exaggeration which will be spared in their addresses to him. In proportion as men's fears or distresses become more urgent, they still invent new strains of adulation, and even he who outdoes his predecessor in swelling up the titles of his divinity, is sure to be outdone by his successor in newer and more pompous epithets of praise. Thus

they proceed, till at last they arrive at infinity itself, beyond which there is no farther progress and it is well if, in striving to get farther, and to represent a magnificent simplicity, they run not into inexplicable mystery, and destroy the intelligent nature of their deity, on which alone any rational worship or adoration can be founded. While they confine themselves to the notion of a perfect being, the Creator of the world, they coincide, by chance, with the principles of reason and true philosophy, though they are guided to that notion, not by reason, of which they are in a great measure incapable, but by the adulation and fears of the most vulgar superstition

We often find, amongst barbarous nations, and even sometimes amongst civilized, that, when every strain of flattery has been exhausted towards arbitrary princes, when every human quality has been applauded to the utmost, their servile courtiers represent them, at last, as real divinities, and point them out to the people as objects of adoration. How much more natural, therefore, is it, that a limited deity, who at first is supposed only the immediate author of the particular goods and ills in life, should in the end be represented as sovereign maker and modifier of the universe?

Even where this notion of a Supreme Deity is already established, though it ought naturally to lessen every other worship, and abase every object of reverence, yet if a nation has entertained the opinion of a subordinate tutelar divinity, saint or angel, their addresses to that being gradually rise upon them, and encroach on the adoration due to their supreme deity The Virgin Mary, ere checked by the reformation, had proceeded, from being merely a good woman, to usurp many attributes of the Almighty God and St. Nicholas go hand in hand, in all the prayers and petitions of the Muscovites

Thus the deity, who, from love, converted himself into a bull, in order to carry off Europa, and who, from ambition, dethroned his father, Saturn, became the OPTIMUS MAXIMUS of the heathens.

The Jacobins, who denied the immaculate conception, have ever been very unhappy in their doctrine, even though political reasons have kept the Romish church from condemning it. The Cordeliers have run away with all the popularity But in the fifteenth century, as we learn from Boulainvilliers [Hist abregee, p 499.], an Italian *Cordelier* maintained, that, during the three days, when CHRIST was interred, the hypostatic union was dissolved, and that his human nature was not a proper object of adoration, during that period. Without the art of divination, one might foretel, that so gross and impious a blasphemy would not fail to be anathematized by the people. It was the occasion of great insults on the part of the Jacobins, who now got some recompense for their misfortunes in the war about the immaculate conception.

Rather than relinquish this propensity to adulation, religionists in

all ages, have involved themselves in the greatest absurdities and contradictions.

Homer, in one passage, calls OCEANUS and TETHYS the original parents of all things, conformably to the established mythology and tradition of the Greeks yet, in other passages, he could not forbear complimenting JUPITER, the reigning deity, with that magnificent appellation, and accordingly denominates him the father of gods and men He forgets that every temple, every street, was full of the ancestors, uncles, brothers, and sisters of this JUPITER, who was in reality nothing but an upstart parricide and usurper A like contradiction is observable in Hesiod, and is so much the less excusable, as his professed intention was to deliver a true genealogy of the gods.

Were there a religion (and we may suspect Mahometanism of this inconsistence), which sometimes painted the Deity in the most sublime colours as the Creator of heaven and earth, sometimes degraded him nearly to a level with human creatures in his powers and faculties; while at the same time it ascribed to him suitable infirmities, passions, and partialities of the moral kind that religion, after it was extinct, would also be cited as an instance of those contradictions which arise from the gross, vulgar, natural conceptions of mankind, opposed to their continual propensity towards flattery and exaggeration Nothing indeed would prove more strongly the divine origin of any religion, than to find (and happily this is the case with Christianity) that it is free from a contradiction so incident to human nature.

SECTION VII —CONFIRMATION OF THIS DOCTRINE.

IT appears certain, that, though the original notions of the vulgar represent the Divinity as a limited being, and consider him only as the particular cause of health or sickness, plenty or want, prosperity or adversity, yet when more magnificent ideas are urged upon them, they esteem it dangerous to refuse their assent. Will you say, that your deity is finite and bounded in his perfections, may be overcome by a greater force, is subject to human passions, pains, and infirmities; has a beginning, and may have an end? This they dare not affirm; but thinking it safest to comply with higher encomiums, they endeavour, by an affected ravishment and devotion, to ingratiate themselves with him. As a confirmation of this, we may observe, that the assent of the vulgar is, in this case, merely verbal, and that they are incapable of conceiving those sublime qualities which they seemingly attribute to the Deity Their real idea of him, not-

withstanding thier pompous language, is still as poor and frivolous as ever.

The original intelligence, says the Magians, who is the first principle of all things, discovers himself *immediately* to the mind and understanding alone; but has placed the sun as his image in the visible universe; and when that bright luminary diffuses its beams over the earth and the firmament, it is a faint copy of the glory which resides in the higher heavens. If you would escape the displeasure of this Divine Being, you must be careful never to set bare foot upon the ground, not spit into a fire, nor throw any water upon it, even though it were consuming a whole city.* Who can express the perfections of the Almighty? Even the noblest of his works, if compared to him, are but dust and rubbish. How much more must human conception fall short of his infinite perfections? His smile and favour render men for ever happy; and to obtain it for your children, the best method is to cut off from them, while infants, a little bit of skin, about half the breadth of a farthing. Take two bits of cloth,* say the *Roman Catholics*, about an inch or an inch and a half square, join them by the corners with two strings or pieces of tape about sixteen inches long, throw this over your head, and make one of the bits of cloth lie upon your breast, and the other upon your back, keeping them next your skin: there is not a better secret for recommending yourself to that Infinite Being, who exists from eternity to eternity.

The Getes, commonly called immortal, from their steady belief of the soul's immortality, were genuine theists and unitarians. They affirmed ZAMOLXIS, their deity, to be the only true god; and asserted the worship of all other nations to be addressed to mere fictions and chimeras. But were their religious principles any more refined, on account of these magnificent pretensions? Every fifth year they sacrificed a human victim, whom they sent as a messenger to their deity, in order to inform him of their wants and necessities. And when it thundered, they were so provoked, that, in order to return the defiance, they let fly arrows at him, and declined not the combat as unequal. Such at least is the account which Herodotus gives of the theism of the immortal Getes. [Lib. iv.]

SECT. VIII.—FLUX AND REFLUX OF POLYTHEISM AND THEISM.

IT is remarkable, that the principles of religion have a kind of flux and reflux in the human mind, and that men have a natural tendency to rise from idolatry to theism, and to sink again from theism

* Hyde de Relig. veterum Persarum.

† Called the Scapulaire.

idolatry. The vulgar, that is, indeed, all mankind, a few excepted, being ignorant and uninstructed, never elevate their contemplation to the heavens, or penetrate by their disquisitions into the secret structure of vegetable or animal bodies, so far as to discover a Supreme Mind or Original Providence, which bestowed order on every part of nature. They consider these amirable works in a more confined and selfish view, and finding their own happiness and misery to depend on the secret influence and unforeseen concurrence of external objects, they regard, with perpetual attention the *unknown causes* which govern all these natural events, and distribute pleasure and pain, good and ill, by their powerful, but silent operation The unknown causes are still appealed to on every emergence, and in this general appearance or confused image, are the perpetual objects of human hopes and fears, wishes and apprehensions By degrees, the active imag nation of men, uneasy in this abstract conception of objects, about which it is incessantly employed, begins to render them more particular, and to clothe them in shapes more suitable to its natural comprehension It represents them to be sensible, intelligent beings, like mankind, actuated by love and hatred, and flexible by gifts and entreaties, by prayers and sacrifices Hence the origin of religion and hence the origin of idolatry or polytheism

But the same anxious concern for happiness, which begets the idea of these invisible intelligent powers, allows not mankind to remain long in the first simple conception of them, as powerful but limited beings, masters of human fate, but slaves to destiny and the course of nature. Men's exaggerated praises and compliments still swell their idea upon them; and elevating their deities to the utmost bounds of perfection, at last beget the attributes of unity and infinity, simplicity and spirituality Such refined ideas, being somewhat disproportioned to vulgar comprehension, remain not long in their original purity, but require to be supported by the notion of inferior mediators or subordinate agents, which interpose between mankind and their supreme deity. These demigods, or middle beings, partaking more of human nature, and being more familiar to us, become the chief objects of devotion, and gradually recal that idolatry, which had been formerly banished by the ardent prayers and panegyrics of timorous and indigent mortals. But as these idolatrous relig ons fall every day into grosser and more vulgar conceptions, they at last destroy themselves, and, by the vile representations which they form of their deities, make the tide turn again toward theism. But so great is the propensity, in this alternate revolution of human sentiments, to return back to idolatry, that the utmost precaution is not able effectually to prevent it. And of this, some theists, particularly the Jews and Mahometans, have been sensible; as appears by their banishing all the arts of statuary and painting, and not allowing the representations, even of human

figures, to be taken by marble or colours, lest the common infirmity of mankind should thence produce idolatry. The feeble apprehensions of men cannot be satisfied with conceiving their deity as a pure spirit and perfect intelligence, and yet their natural terrors keep them from imputing to him the least shadow of limitation and imperfection. They fluctuate between these opposite sentiments. The same infirmity still drags them downwards, from an omnipotent and spiritual Deity to a limited and corporeal one, and from a corporeal and limited deity to a statue or visible representation. The same endeavour at elevation still pushes them upwards, from the statue or material image to the invisible power, and from the invisible power to an infinitely perfect Deity, the Creator and Sovereign of the universe.

SECT, IX.—COMPARISON OF THESE RELIGIONS, WITH REGARD TO PERSECUTION AND TOLERATION.

POLYTHEISM, or idolatrous worship, being founded entirely in vulgar traditions, is liable to this great inconvenience, that any practice or opinion, however barbarous or corrupted, may be authorised by it, and full scope is given for knavery to impose on credulity, till morals and humanity be expelled the religious systems of mankind. At the same time, idolatry is attended with this evident advantage, that, by limiting the powers and functions of its deities, it naturally admits the gods of other sects and nations to a share of divinity, and renders all the various deities, as well as rites, ceremonies, or traditions, compatible with others.* Theism is opposite both in its advantages and disadvantages. As that system supposes one sole deity, the perfection of reason and goodness, it should, if justly prosecuted, banish every thing frivolous, unreasonable, or inhuman from religious worship, and set before men the most illustrious example, as well as the most commanding motives, of justice and benevolence. These mighty advantages are not indeed over-balanced (for that is not impossible), but somewhat diminished, by inconveniencies, which arise from the vices and prejudices of mankind. While one sole object of devotion is acknowledged, the worship of other deities is regarded as absurd and impious. Nay, this unity of object seems naturally to

* Verrius Flaccus, cited by Pliny, lib. xxviii. cap. 2. affirmed, that it was usual for the Romans, before they laid siege to any town, to invocate the tutelar deity of the place, and by promising him greater honours than those he at present enjoyed, bribe him to betray his old friends and votaries. The name of the tutelar deity of Rome was for this reason kept a most religious mystery, lest the enemies of the republic should be able, in the same manner, to draw him over to their service. For without the name, they thought nothing of that kind could be practised. Pliny says, that the common form of invocation was preserved to his time in the ritual of the pontiff's. And Macrobius has transmitted a copy of it from the secret things of Sammonicus Serenus.

require the unity of faith and ceremonies, and furnishes designing men with a pretence for representing their adversaries as profane, and the objects of Divine as well as human vengeance For as each sect is positive that its own faith and worship are entirely acceptable to the Deity, and as no one can conceive, that the same being should be pleased with different and opposite rites and principles, the several sects fall naturally into animosity, and mutually discharge on each other that sacred zeal and rancour, the most furious and implacable of all human passions

The tolerating spirit of idolators, both in ancient and modern times, is very obvious to any one, who is the least conversant in the writings of historians or travellers When the oracle of Delphi was asked, what rites or worship was most acceptable to the gods? Those which are legally established, in each city, replied the oracle [Xenoph Memor lib ii] Even priests, in those ages, could, it seems, allow salvation to those of a different communion The Romans commonly adopted the gods of the conquered people, and never disputed the attributes of those local and national deities, in whose territories they resided The religious wars and persecutions of the Egyptian idolaters are indeed an exception to this rule, but are accounted for by ancient authors from reasons singular and remarkable Different species of animals were the deities of the different sects among the Egyptians, and the deities being in continual war, engaged their votaries in the same contention The worshippers of dogs could not long remain in peace with the adorers of cats or wolves [Plutarch de Isid & Osiride] But where that reason took not place, the Egyptian superstition was not so incompatible as is commonly imagined, since we learn from Herodotus, [Lib ii sub fine] that very large contributions were given by Amasis towards rebuilding the temple of Delphi.

The intolerance of almost all religions, which have maintained the unity of God, is as remarkable as the contrary principle of polytheists. The implacable narrow spirit of the Jews is well known Mahometanism set out with still more bloody principles, and even to this day, deals out damnation, though not fire and faggot, to all other sects. And if, among Christians, the English and Dutch, have embraced the principles of toleration, this singularity has proceeded from the steady resolution of the civil magistrate, in opposition to the continued efforts of bigots.

The disciples of Zoroaster shut the doors of heaven against all but the MAGIANS. [Hyde de Relig vet. Persarum] Nothing could more obstruct the progress of the Persian conquests, than the furious zeal of that nation against the temples and images of the Greeks. And after the overthrow of that empire, we find Alexander, as a polytheist, immediately re-establishing the worship of the Babylonians, which

their former princes, as monotheists, had carefully abolished.* Even the blind and devoted attachment of that conqueror to the Greek superstition hindered not, but he himself sacrificed according to the Babylonish rites and ceremonies. [Id. ibid.]

So sociable is polytheism, that the utmost fierceness and antipathy, which it meets with in an opposite religion, is scarcely able to disgust it, and keep it at a distance. Augustus praised extremely the reserve of his grandson, Caius Cæsar, when this latter prince, passing by Jerusalem, deigned not to sacrifice according to the Jewish law. But for what reason did Augustus so much approve of this conduct? Only because that religion was by the Pagans esteemed ignoble and barbarous. [Sueton. in vita Aug. c. 93.]

I may venture to affirm, that few corruptions of idolatry and polytheism, are more pernicious to society than this corruption of theism,* when carried to the utmost height. The human sacrifices of the Carthaginians, Mexicans, and many barbarous nations,† scarcely exceed the inquisition and persecutions of Rome and Madrid. For besides, that the effusion of blood may not be so great in the former case as in the latter; besides this, I say, the human victims, being chosen by lot, or by some exterior signs, affect not, in so considerable a degree, the rest of the society. Whereas virtue, knowledge, love of liberty, are the qualities, which call down the fatal vengeance of inquisitors; and, when expelled, leave the society in the most shameful ignorance, corruption, and bondage. The illegal murder of one man by a tyrant is more pernicious than the death of a thousand by pestilence, famine, or any undistinguishing calamity.

In the temple of Diana at Aricia near Rome, who ever murdered the present priest, was legally entitled to be installed his successor. [Strabo, lib. v. Sueton. in vita Cal.] A very singular institution! For, however barbarous and bloody the common superstitions often are to the laity, they usually turn to the advantage of the whole order.

SECTION X.—WITH REGARD TO COURAGE OR ABASEMENT.

FROM the comparison of theism and idolatry, we may form some other observations, which will also confirm the vulgar observation, that the corruption of the best things give rise to the worst.

* Arrian de Exped. lib. iii. Id. lib. vii.

* Corruptio optimi pessima.

† Most nations have fallen into this guilt of human sacrifices; though, perhaps, that impious superstition has never prevailed very much in any civilized nation, unless we except the Carthaginians. For the Tyrians soon abolished it. A sacrifice is conceived as a present; any present is delivered to their deity, by destroying it, and rendering it useless to men; by burning what is solid, pouring out the liquid, and killing the animate. For want of a better way of doing him service, we do ourselves an injury; and fancy that we thereby express, at least, the heartiness of our good-will and adoration. Thus our mercenary devotion deceives ourselves, and imagines it deceives the deity.

Where the Deity is represented as infinitely superior to mankind, this belief, though altogether just, is apt, when joined with superstitious terrors, to sink the human mind into the lowest submission and abasement, and to represent the monkish virtues of mortification, penance, humility, and passive suffering, as the only qualities which are acceptable to him But where the gods are conceived to be only a little superior to mankind, and to have been, many of them, advanced from that inferior rank, we are more at our ease in our addresses to them, and may even, without profaneness, aspire sometimes to a rivalship and emulation of them Hence activity spirit, courage, magnanimity, love of liberty, and all the virtues which aggrandize a people.

The heroes in Paganism correspond exactly to the saints in Popery and holy dervises in Mahometanism The place of HERCULES, THESEUS, HECTOR, ROMULUS, is now supplied by DOMINIC, FRANCIS, ANTHONY, and BENEDICT Instead of the destruction of monsters, the subduing of tyrants, the defence of our native country, whippings and fastings, cowardice and humility, abject submission and slavish obedience, are become the means of obtaining celestial honours among mankind

One great incitement to the pious Alexander in his warlike expeditions, was his rivalship of Hercules and Bacchus, whom he justly pretended to have excelled [Arrian passim] Brasidas, that generous and noble Spartan, after falling in battle, had heroic honours paid him by the inhabitants of Amphipolis, whose defence he had embraced [Thucyd. lib v] And in general, all founders of states and colonies among the Greeks were raised to this inferior rank of divinity, by those who reaped the benefit of their labours

This gave rise to the observation of Machiavel [Discorsi, lib vi], that the doctrines of the Christian religion, meaning the Catholic (for he knew no other), which recommend only passive courage and suffering, had subdued the spirit of mankind, and had fitted them for slavery and subjection. An observation, which would certainly be just, were there not many other circumstances in human society which control the genius and character of a religion

Brasidas seized a mouse, and, being bit by it, let it go. *There is nothing so contemptible*, said he, *but what may be safe, if it has but courage to defend itself* [Plut Apopth] Bellarmine patiently and humbly allowed the fleas and other odious vermin to prey upon him. *We shall have heaven*, said he, *to reward us for our sufferings: but these poor creatures have nothing but the enjoyment of the present life.* [[illegible], art BELLARMINE.] Such difference is there between the [illegible] of a Greek hero and a Catholic saint

SECTION XI.—WITH REGARD TO REASON OR ABSURDITY.

HERE is another observation to the same purpose, and a new proof that the corruption of the best things begets the worst. If we examine, without prejudice, the ancient heathen mythology, as contained in the poets, we shall not discover in it any such monstrous absurdity, as we may at first be apt to apprehend. Where is the difficulty in conceiving, that the same powers or principles, whatever they were, which formed this visible world, men and animals, produced also a species of intelligent creatures, of more refined substance and greater authority than the rest? That these creatures may be capricious, revengeful, passionate, voluptuous, is easily conceived; nor is any circumstance more apt, among ourselves, to engender such vices, than the licence of absolute authority. And, in short, the whole mythological system is so natural, that, in the vast variety of planets and worlds, contained in this universe, it seems more than probable, that, somehow or other, it is really carried into execution.

The chief objection to it with regard to this planet is, that it is not ascertained by any just reason or authority. The ancient tradition, insisted on by heathen priests and theologers, is but a weak foundation; and transmitted also such a number of contradictory reports, supported, all of them, by equal authority, that it became absolutely impossible to fix a preference amongst them. A few volumes, therefore, must contain all the polemical writings of pagan priests: and their whole theology must consist more of traditional stories and superstitious practices than of philosophical argument and controversy.

But where theism forms the fundamental principle of any popular religion, that tenet is so conformable to sound reason, that philosophy is apt to incorporate itself with such a system of theology. And if the other dogmas of that system be contained in a sacred book, such as the Alcoran, or be determined by any visible authority, like that of the Roman pontiff, speculative reasoners naturally carry on their assent, and embrace a theory, which has been instilled into them by their earliest education, and which also possesses some degree of consistence and uniformity. But as these appearances are sure, all of them, to prove deceitful, philosophy will soon find herself very unequally yoked with her new associate; and instead of regulating each principle, as they advance together, she is at every turn perverted to serve the purposes of superstition. For besides the unavoidable incoherences, which must be reconciled and adjusted, one may safely affirm, that all popular theology, especially the scholastic, has a kind of appetite for absurdity and contradiction. If that theology went not beyond reason and common sense, her doctrines would appear too

easy and familiar Amazement must of necessity be raised mystery affected darkness and obscurity sought after and a foundation of merit afforded to the devout votaries, who desire an opportunity of subduing their rebellious reason, by the belief of the most unintelligible sophisms

Ecclesiastical history sufficiently confirms these reflections When a controversy is started, some people always pretend with certainty to foretel the issue Whichever opinion, say they, is most contrary to plain sense, is sure to prevail, even where the general interest of the system requires not that decision Though the reproach of heresy may, for some time, be bandied about among the disputants, it always rests at last on the side of reason. Any one, it is pretended, that has but learning enough of this kind to know the definition of ARIAN, PELAGIAN, ERASTIAN, SOCINIAN, SABELLIAN, EUTYCHIAN, NESTORIAN, MONOTHELITE, &c, not to mention PROTESTANT, whose fate is yet uncertain, will be convinced of the truth of this observation. It is thus a system becomes more absurd in the end, merely from its being reasonable and philosophical in the beginning

To oppose the torrent of scholastic religion by such feeble maxims as these, that, *it is impossible for the same thing, to be and not to be*, that *the whole is greater than a part*, that *two and three make five*, is pretending to stop the ocean with a bull-rush Will you set up profane reason against sacred mystery? No punishment is great enough for your impiety And the same fires, which were kindled for heretics, will serve also for the destruction of philosophers.

SECTION XII —WITH REGARD TO DOUBT OR CONVICTION

WE meet every day with people so sceptical with regard to history, that they assert it impossible for any nation ever to believe such absurd principles as were those of Greek and Egyptian paganism and at the same time so dogmatical with regard to religion, that they think the same absurdities are to be found in no other communion. Cambyses entertained like prejudices, and very impiously ridiculed, and even wounded, Apis, the great god of the Egyptians, who appeared to his profane senses nothing but a large spotted bull But Herodotus judiciously ascribes this sally of passion to a real madness or disorder of the brain otherwise, says the historian, he never would have openly affronted any established worship. For on that head, continues he, every nation are best satisfied with their own, and think they have the advantage over every other nation.

It must be allowed, that the Roman Catholics are a very learned sect; and that no one communion, but that of the church of England,

can dispute their being the most learned of all the Christian churches; yet Averroes, the famous Arabian, who, no doubt, had heard of the Egyptian superstitions, declares, that, of all religions, the most absurd and nonsensical is that, whose votaries eat, after having created, their deity.

I lodged once at Paris in the same hotel with an ambassador from Tunis, who, having passed some years at London, was returning home that way. One day I observed his Moorish excellency diverting himself under the porch with surveying the splendid equipages that drove along; when there chanced to pass that way some *Capucin* friars, who had never seen a Turk; as he, on his part, though accustomed to the European dresses, had never seen the grotesque figure of a *Capucin*: and there is no expressing the mutual admiration with which they inspired each other. Had the chaplain of the embassy entered into a dispute with these Franciscans, their reciprocal surprise had been of the same nature. Thus all mankind stand staring at one another; and there is no beating it into their heads, that the turban of the African is not just as good or as bad a fashion as the cowl of the European. *He is a very honest man*, said the prince of Sallee, speaking of de Ruyter, *It is a pity he were a Christian.*

How can you worship leeks and onions? we shall suppose a Sorbonnist to say to a priest of Sais. If we worship them, replies the latter; at least, we do not, at the same time, eat them. But what strange objects of adoration are cats and monkeys? says the learned doctor. They are at least as good as the relics or rotten bones of martyrs, answers his no less learned antagonist. Are you not mad, insists the Catholic, to cut one another's throat about the preference of a cabbage or a cucumber? Yes, says the pagan; I allow it, if you will confess, that those are still madder, who fight about the preference among volumes of sophistry, ten thousand of which are not equal in value to one cabbage or cucumber.*

Every by-stander will easily judge (but unfortunately the by-standers are few), that if nothing were requisite to establish any popular system, but exposing the absurdities of other systems, every votary of every superstition could give a sufficient reason for his blind and bigotted

* It is strange that the Egyptian religion, though so absurd, should yet have borne so great a resemblance to the Jewish, that ancient writers, even of the greatest genius, were not able to observe any difference between them. For it is remarkable that both Tacitus and Suetonius, when they mention that decree of the senate, under Tiberius, by which the Egyptian and Jewish proselytes were banished from Rome, expressly treat these religions as the same; and it appears, that even the decree itself was founded on that supposition. 'Actum et de sacris Egyptiis, Judaicisque pellendis; factumque patrum consultum, ut quatuor millia libertini generis *ea superstitione* infecta, quis idonea aetas, in insulam Sardiniam veherentur, coercendis illic latrociniis; et si ob gravitatem coeli interissent, vile damnum: ceteri cederent Italia, nisi certam ante diem profanos ritus exuissent.' Tacit. Ann. lib. ii. c. 85. '*Externas* caeremonias, Egyptios, Judaicosque ritus compescuit; coactis qui *superstitione ea* tenebantur, religiosas vestes cum instrumento omni comburere, &c.' Sueton. Tiber. c. 36. These wise heathens, observing something in the general air, and genius, and spirit of the two religions, to be the same, esteemed the differences of their dogmas too frivolous to deserve any attention.

conformable to the principles in which he has been educated. But without so extensive a knowledge, on which to ground this assurance (and perhaps, better without it), there is not wanting a sufficient stock of religious zeal and faith among mankind. Diodorus Siculus [Lib. i.] gives a remarkable instance to this purpose, of which he was himself an eye-witness. While Egypt lay under the greatest terror of the Roman name, a legionary soldier having inadvertently been guilty of the sacrilegious impiety of killing a cat, the whole people rose upon him with the utmost fury, and all the efforts of the prince were not able to save him. The senate and people of Rome, I am persuaded, would not, then, have been so delicate with regard to their national deities. They very frankly, a little after that time, voted Augustus a place in the celestial mansions, and would have dethroned every god in heaven, for his sake had he seemed to desire it *Presens divus habebitur Augustus*, says Horace That is a very important point and in other nations and other ages, the same circumstance has not been deemed altogether indifferent *

Notwithstanding the sanctity of our holy religion, says Tully [De Nat. Deor l. 1], no crime is more common with us then sacrilege but was it ever heard of, that an Egyptian violated the temple of a cat, an ibis, or a crocodile? There is no torture, an Egyptian would not undergo, says the same author in another place [Tusc Quæst lib v], rather than injure an ibis, an aspic, a cat, a dog, or a crocodile. Thus it is strictly true, what Dryden observes,

'Of whatso'er descent their godhead be,
'Stock, stone, or other homely pedigree,
'In his defence his servants are as bold,
'As if he had been born of beaten gold.'

ABSALOM and ACHITOPHEL.

Nay, the baser the materials are, of which the divinity is composed, the greater devotion is he likely to excite in the breasts of his deluded votaries, They exult in their shame, and make a merit with their deity, in braving, for his sake, all the ridicule and contumely of his enemies. Ten thousand Crusaders enlist themselves under the holy banners; and even openly triumph in those parts of their religion, which their adversaries regard as the most reproachful.

There occurs, I own, a difficulty in the Egyptian system of theology; as, indeed, few systems of that kind are entirely free from difficulties. It is evident, from their method of propagation, that a couple of cats, in fifty years, would stock a whole kingdom; and if that reli-

* When Louis the XIV. took on himself the protection of the Jesuits' College of Clermont, [illegible] the king's arms to be put up over the gate, and took down the cross [illegible] for it: which gave occasion to the following epigram.

Sustulit hinc Christi, posuitque insignia Regis:
Impia gens, alium nescit habere Deum.

gious veneration were still paid them, it would, in twenty more, not only be easier in Egypt to find a god than a man, which Petronius says was the case in some parts of Italy; but the gods must at last entirely starve the men, and leave themselves neither priests nor votaries remaining It is probable, therefore, that this wise nation, the most celebrated in antiquity for prudence and sound policy, foreseeing such dangerous consequences, reserved all their worship for the full-grown divinities, and used the freedom to drown the holy spawn or little sucking gods, without any scruple or remorse

The learned, philosophical Varro, discoursing of religion, pretends not to deliver any thing beyond probabilities and appearances such was his good sense and moderation! But the passionate, the zealous Augustin, insults the noble Roman on his scepticism and reserve, and professes the most thorough belief and assurance [De civitate Dei, l iii c 17] A heathen poet, however, contemporary with the saint, absurdly esteems the religious system of the latter so false, that even the credulity of children could not engage them to believe it *

It is strange, when mistakes are so common, to find every one positive and dogmatical? And that the zeal often rises in proportion to the error!

If ever there was a nation or a time, in which the public religion lost all authority over mankind, we might expect, that infidelity in Rome, during the Ciceronian age, would openly have erected its throne, and that Cicero himself, in every speech and action, would have been its most declared abettor But it appears, that, whatever sceptical liberties that great man might take, in his writings or in philosophical conversation he yet avoided, in the common conduct of life, the imputation of deism and profaneness Even in his own family, and to his wife Terentia, whom he highly trusted, he was willing to appear a devout religionist, and there remains a letter, addressed to her, in which he seriously desires her to offer sacrifice to Apollo and Æsculapius, in gratitude for the recovery of his health. [Lib xiv epist. 7]

Pompey's devotion was much more sincere in all his conduct, during the civil wars, he paid a great regard to auguries, dreams, and prophecies [Cicero de Divin. lib ii c 24.] Augustus was tainted with superstition of every kind. As it is reported of Milton, that his poetical genius never flowed with ease and abundance in the spring: so Augustus observed, that his own genius for dreaming never was so perfect during that season, nor was so much to be relied on, as during the rest of the year That great and able emperor was also extremely uneasy, when he happened to change his shoes, and put the right foot shoe on the left foot.† In short, it cannot be denied,

* Claudii Rutilii Numatiani iter, lib. i. l. 386.
† Sueton. Aug. cap. 90, 91, 92. Plin. lib. ii. cap. 5.

but the votaries of the established superstition of antiquity were as numerous in every state, as those of the modern religion are at present. Its influence was as universal, though it was not so great. As many people gave their assent to it, though that assent was not seemingly so strong, precise, and affirmative.

A cause, which rendered the ancient religions much looser than the modern, is, that the former were *traditional* and the latter are *scriptural*, and the tradition in the former was complex, contradictory, and, on many occasions, doubtful, so that it could not possibly be reduced to any standard and canon, or afford any determinate articles of faith. The stories of the gods were numberless like the popish legends; and though every one, almost, believed a part of these stories, yet no one could believe or know the whole. while, at the same time, all must have acknowledged, that no one part stood on a better foundation than the rest. The traditions of different cities and nations were also, on many occasions, directly opposite, and no reason could be assigned for preferring one to the other. And as there was an infinite number of stories, with regard to which tradition was nowise positive, the gradation was insensible, from the most fundamental articles of faith, to those loose and precarious fictions. The pagan religion, therefore, seemed to vanish like a cloud, whenever one approached to it, and examined it piecemeal. It could never be ascertained by any fixed dogmas and principles. And though this did not convert the generality of mankind from so absurd a faith, for when will the people be reasonable? yet it made them falter and hesitate more in maintaining their principles, and was even apt to produce, in certain dispositions of mind, some practices and opinions, which had the appearance of determined infidelity.

To which we may add, that the fables of the pagan religion were, of themselves, light, easy, and familiar. Who could forbear smiling, when he thought of the loves of MARS and VENUS, or the amorous frolics of JUPITER and PAN? In this respect, it was a true poetical religion, if it had not rather too much levity for the graver kinds of poetry. We find that it has been adopted by modern bards, nor have these talked with greater freedom and irreverence of the gods, whom they regarded as fictions, than the ancients did of the real objects of their devotion.

The inference is by no means just, that, because a system of religion has made no deep impression on the minds of a people, it must therefore have been positively rejected by all men of common sense, and that opposite principles, in spite of the prejudices of education, were generally established by argument and reasoning. I know not, but a contrary influence may be more probable.

LUCIAN tells us expressly [Philopseudes], that whoever believed not the most ridiculous fables of paganism was deemed by the people

profane and impious To what purpose, indeed, would that agreeable author have employed the whole force of his wit and satire against the national religion, had not that religion been generally believed by his countrymen and contemporaries?

Livy [Lib x cap 40], acknowledges as frankly, as any divine would at present, the common incredulity of his age, but then he condemns it as severely And who can imagine, that a national superstition, which could delude so ingenious a man, would not also impose on the generality of the people?

The Stoics bestowed many magnificent and even impious epithets on their sage, that he alone was rich, free, a king, and equal to the immortal gods. They forgot to add, that he was not superior in prudence and understanding to an old woman For surely nothing can be more pitiful than the sentiments, which that sect entertained with regard to religious matters, while they seriously agree with the common augurs, that, when a raven croaks from the left, it is a good omen, but a bad one, when a rook makes a noise from the same quarter Panætius was the only Stoic, among the Greeks, who so much as doubted with regard to auguries and divinations* Marcus Antoninus [Lib 1 § 17], tells us, that he himself had received many admonitions from the gods in his sleep It is true, Epictetus [Ench. § 17] forbids us to regard the language of rooks and ravens, but it is not, that they do not speak truth it is only, because they can foretel nothing but the breaking of our neck or the forfeiture of our estate, which are circumstances, says he, that nowise concern us Thus the Stoics join a philosophical enthusiasm to a religious superstition. The force of their mind, being all turned to the side of morals, unbent itself in that of religion †

Plato [Eutyphro] introduces Socrates affirming, that the accusation of impiety raised against him was owing entirely to his rejecting such fables, as those of SATURN'S castrating his father URANUS, and JUPITER'S dethroning SATURN yet in a subsequent dialogue [Phædo], Socrates confesses that the doctrine of the mortality of the soul was the received opinion of the people Is there here any contradiction? Yes, surely but the contradiction is not in Plato, it is in the people, whose religious principles in general are always composed of the most discordant parts, especially in an age, when superstition sate so easy and light upon them ‡

* Cicero de Divin. lib. i. cap 3, et 7

† The Stoics, I own, were not quite orthodox in the established religion, but one may see from these instances, that they went a great way And the people undoubtedly went every length.

‡ Xenophon's conduct, as related by himself, is, at once, an incontestible proof of the general credulity of mankind in those ages, and the incoherences, in all ages, of men's opinions in religious matters. That great captain and philosopher, the disciple of Socrates, and one who has delivered some of the most refined sentiments with regard to a deity, gave all the following marks of vulgar pagan superstition. By Socrates' advice, he consulted the oracle of Delphi, before he would engage in the expedition of Cyrus. De exped. lib. iii. p

Though some parts of the national religion hung loose upon the minds of men, other parts adhered more closely to them. And it was the chief business of the sceptical philosophers to show, that there was no more foundation for one than for the other. This is the artifice of Cotta in the dialogues concerning the *nature of the gods*. He refutes the whole system of mythology by leading the orthodox, gradually, from the more momentous stories, which were believed, to the more frivolous, which every one ridiculed; from the gods to the goddesses; from the goddesses to the nymphs; from the nymphs to the fawns and satyrs. His master, Carneades, has employed the same method of reasoning.*

SECTION XIII.—IMPIOUS CONCEPTIONS OF THE DIVINE NATURE IN POPULAR RELIGIONS OF BOTH KINDS.

THE primary religion of mankind arises chiefly from an anxious fear of future events; and what ideas will naturally be entertained of invisible, unknown powers, while men lie under dismal apprehensions of any kind, may easily be conceived. Every image of vengeance, severity, cruelty, and malice, must occur, and must augment the ghastliness and horror which oppresses the amazed religionist. A panic having once seized the mind, the active fancy still farther multiplies the objects of terror; while that profound darkness, or what is worse, that glimmering light, with which we are environed, represents the spectres of divinity under the most dreadful appearances imaginable. And no idea of perverse wickedness can be framed, which those terrified devotees do not readily, and without scruple, apply to their deity.

This appears the natural state of religion when surveyed in one

294. ex. edit. Leuncl. Sees a dream the night after the generals were seized, which he pays great regard to, but thinks ambiguous. Id. p. 295. He and the whole army regard sneezing as a very lucky omen. Id. p. 300. Has another dream when he comes to the river Centrites, which his fellow general, Chirosophus, also pays great regard to. Id. lib. iv. p. 323. The Greeks, suffering from a cold north wind, sacrifice to it; and the historian observes that it immediately abated. Id. p. 329. Xenophon consults the sacrifices in secret, before he would form any resolution with himself about settling a colony. Lib. 5. p. 359. He was himself a very skilful augur. Id. p. 361. Is determined by the victims to refuse the sole command of the army which was offered him. Lib. vi. p. 273. Cleander, the Spartan, though very desirous of it, refuses it for the same reason. Id. p. 302. Xenophon mentions an old dream with the interpretation given him, when he first joined Cyrus, p. 373. Mentions also the place of Hercules' descent into hell as believing it, and says the marks of it are still remaining. Id. p. 375. Had almost starved the army, rather than lead them to the field against the auspices. Id. p. 382, 383. His friend, Euclides, the augur, would not believe that he had brought no money from the expedition, till he (Euclides) sacrificed, and then he saw the matter clearly in the Exta. Lib. vii. p. 425. The same philosopher, proposing a project of mines for the increase of the Athenian revenues, advises them first to consult the oracle. De rat. red. p. 392. That all this devotion was not a farce, in order to serve a political purpose, appears both from the facts themselves, and from the genius of that age, when little or nothing could be gained by hypocrisy. Besides, Xenophon, as appears from his Memorabilia, was a kind of heretic in those times, which no political devotee ever is.

* Sext. Empir. advers. Mathem. lib. viii.

light. But if we consider, on the other hand, that spite of praise and eulogy which necessarily has place in all religions, and which is the consequence of these very terrors, we must expect a quite contrary system of theology to prevail Every virtue, every excellence, must be ascribed to the Divinity, and no exaggeration will be deemed sufficient to reach those perfections with which he is endowed. Whatever strains of panegyric can be invented, are immediately embraced, without consulting any arguments or phenomena It is esteemed a sufficient confirmation of them, that they give us more magnificent ideas of the divine objects of our worship and adoration

Here, therefore, is a kind of contradiction between the different principles of human nature which enter into religion Our natural terrors present the notion of a devilish and malicious deity our propensity to adulation leads us to acknowledge an excellent and divine And the influence of these opposite principles are various, according to the different situation of the human understanding

In very barbarous and ignorant nations, such as the Africans and Indians nay even the Japanese, who can form no extensive ideas of power and knowledge, worship may be paid to a being whom they confess to be wicked and detestable, though they may be cautious, perhaps, of pronouncing this judgment of him in public, or in his temple, where he may be supposed to hear their reproaches

Such rude imperfect ideas of the Divinity adhere long to all idolaters, and it may safely be affirmed, that the Greeks themselves never got entirely rid of them It is remarked by Xenophon [Mem. lib 1], in praise of Socrates, that this philosopher assented not to the vulgar opinion, which supposed the gods to know some things, and be ignorant of others he maintained, that they knew every thing, what was done, said or even thought But as this was a strain of philosophy* much above the conception of his countrymen, we need not be surprised, if very frankly, in their books and conversation, they blamed the deities whom they worshipped in their temples It is observable, that Herodotus, in particular, scruples not, in many passages, to ascribe *envy* to the gods, a sentiment, of all others, the most suitable to a mean and devilish nature The pagan hymns, however, sung in public worship, contained nothing but epithets of praise, even while the actions ascribed to the gods were the most barbarous and detestable When Timotheus, the poet, recited a hymn to DIANA, in which he enumerated, with the greatest eulogies, all the actions and attributes of that cruel, capricious goddess *May your daughter*, said one present, *become such as the deity whom you celebrate.* [Plutarch, de Supersit.]

* It was considered among the ancients as a very extraordinary philosophical paradox, that the presence of the gods was not confined to the heavens, but were extended every where; as we learn from Lucian. *Hermotimus sive De sectis*

But as men farther exalt their idea of their divinity, it is their notion of his power and knowledge only, not of his goodness, which is improved. On the contrary, in proportion to the supposed extent of his science and authority, their terrors naturally augment, while they believe, that no secrecy can conceal them from his scrutiny, and that even the inmost recesses of their breast lie open before him. They must then be careful not to form expressly any sentiment of blame and disapprobation All must be applause, ravishment, ecstacy And while their gloomy apprehensions make them ascribe to him measures of conduct, which, in human creatures, would be highly blamed, they must still affect to praise and admire that conduct in the object of their devotional addresses Thus it may safely be affirmed, that popular religions are really, in the conception of their more vulgar votaries, a species of dæmonism, and the higher the deity is exalted in power and knowledge, the lower, of course, is he depressed in goodness and benevolence, whatever epithets of praise may be bestowed on him by his amazed adorers Among idolaters, the words may be false, and belie the secret opinion but among more exalted religionists the opinion itself contracts a kind of falsehood and belies the inward sentiment.

Lucian [Necyomantia] observes, that a young man who reads the history of the gods in Homer or Hesiod, and finds their factions wars, injustice, incest, adultery, and other immoralities so highly celebrated, is much surprised afterwards, when he comes into the world, to observe that punishments are by law inflicted on the same actions which he had been taught to ascribe to superior beings The contradiction is still perhaps stronger between the representations given us by some later religions and our natural ideas of generosity lenity impartiality, and justice, and in proportion to the multiplied terrors of these religions, the barbarous conceptions of the divinity are multiplied upon us * Nothing can preserve untainted the genuine principles of morals in our judgment of human conduct but the absolute necessity of these principles to the existence of society If common conception can indulge princes in a system of ethics, somewhat different from that which should regulate private persons, how much more those superior beings, whose attributes, views, and nature, are so totally unknown to us? *Sunt superis sua jura* [Ovid Metam lib. ix. 501] The gods have maxims of justice peculiar to themselves

* Bacchus, a divine being, is represented by the heathen mythology as the inventor of dancing and the theatre Plays were anciently even a part of public worship on the most solemn occasions, and often employed in times of pestilence to appease the offended deities But they have been zealously proscribed by the godly in later ages, and the play-house according to a learned divine, is the porch of hell.

SECTION XIV.—BAD INFLUENCE OF POPULAR RELIGIONS ON MORALITY.

WHEN the old Romans were attacked with a pestilence, they never ascribed their sufferings to their vices, or dreamed of repentance and amendment. They never thought, that they were the general robbers of the world, whose ambition and avarice made desolate the earth, and reduced opulent nations to want and beggary. They only created a dictator,* in order to drive a nail into a door; and by that means, they thought they had sufficiently appeased their incensed deity.

In Ægina, one faction forming a conspiracy, barbarously and treacherously assassinated seven hundred of their fellow-citizens; and carried their fury so far, that, one miserable fugitive having fled to the temple, they cut off his hands by which he clung to the gates, and carrying him out of holy ground, immediately murdered him. *By this impiety*, says Herodotus [Lib. vi.] (not by the other many cruel assassinations), *they offended the gods, and contracted an inexpiable guilt.*

The sublime prologue of Zaleucus' [to be found in Diod. Sic. lib. xii.] laws inspired not the Locrians, so far as we can learn, with any sounder notions of the measures of acceptance with the deity, than were familiar to the other Greeks.

This observation, then, holds, universally: but still one may be at some loss to account for it. It is not sufficient to observe, that the people, every where, degrade their deities into a similitude with themselves, and consider them merely as a species of human creatures, somewhat more potent and intelligent. This will not remove the difficulty. For there is no *man* so stupid, as that, judging by his natural reason, he would not esteem virtue and honesty the most valuable qualities which any person could possess. Why not ascribe the same sentiment to his deity? Why not make all religion, or the chief part of it, to consist in these attainments?

Nor is it satisfactory to say, that the practice of morality is more difficult than that of superstition; and is therefore rejected. All virtue, when men are reconciled to it by ever so little practice, is agreeable: all superstition is for ever odious and burthensome.

Perhaps, the following account may be received as a true solution of the difficulty. The duties, which a man performs as a friend or parent, seem merely owing to his benefactor or children; nor can he be wanting to these duties without breaking through all the ties of nature and morality. A strong inclination may prompt him to the performance: a sentiment of order and moral obligation joins its

* Called Dictator clavis figendæ causa. T. Livii, l. vii. c. 3.

force to these natural ties and the whole man, if truly virtuous, is drawn to his duty without any effort or endeavour Even with regard to the virtues which are more austere, and more founded on reflection, such as public spirit, filial duty, temperance, or integrity, the moral obligation, in our apprehension, removes all pretension to religious merit, and the virtuous conduct is deemed no more than what we owe to society and to ourselves In all this, a superstitious man considers not, that the most genuine method of serving the Divinity is by promoting the happiness of his creatures He still looks out for some more immediate service of the Supreme Being, in order to allay those terrors with which he is haunted In restoring a loan, or paying a debt, his divinity is nowise beholden to him, because these acts of justice are what he was bound to perform, and what many would have performed, where there no god in the universe But if he fast a day, or give himself a sound whipping, this has a direct reference, in his opinion, to the service of God No other motive could engage him to such austerities By these distinguished marks of devotion, he has now acquired the Divine favour, and may expect, in recompense, protection and safety in this world, and eternal happiness in the next.

Bomilcar, having formed a conspiracy for assassinating at once the whole senate of Carthage, and invading the liberties of his country, lost the opportunity from a continual regard to omens and prophecies *Those who undertake the most criminal and most dangerous enterprizes are commonly the most superstitious,* as an ancient historian [Diod Sic lib xv] remarks on this occasion Their devotion and spiritual faith rise with their fears Catiline was not contented with the established deities, and received rites of the national religion his anxious terrors made him seek new inventions of this kind * which he never probably had dreamed of, had he remained a good citizen, and obedient to the laws of his country.

SECT XV —GENERAL COROLLARY.

THOUGH the stupidity of men, barbarous and uninstructed, be so great, that they may not see a Sovereign Author in the more obvious works of nature to which they are so much familiarised, yet it scarcely seems possible, that any one of good understanding should reject that idea, when once it is suggested to him. A purpose, an intention, a design is evident in every thing, and when our comprehension is so far enlarged as to contemplate the first rise of this visible system, we

* Cic. Catil. i. Sallust. de bello Catil.

must adopt, with the strongest conviction, the idea of some intelligent cause or author The uniform maxims too, which prevail throughout the whole frame of the universe, naturally, if not necessarily, lead us to conceive this intelligence as single and undivided, where the prejudices of education oppose not so reasonable a theory Even the contrarities of nature, by discovering themselves every where, become proofs of some consistent plan, and establish one single purpose or intention, however inexplicable and incomprehensible

Good and ill are universally intermingled and confounded, happiness and misery, wisdom and folly, virtue and vice Nothing is pure and entirely of a piece All advantages are attended with disadvantages An universal compensation prevails in all conditions of being and existence And it is not possible for us, by our most chimerical wishes, to form the idea of a station or situation altogether desirable The draughts of life, according to the poet's fiction, are always mixed from the vessels on each hand of Jupiter or if any cup be presented altogether pure, it is drawn only, as the same poet tells us, from the left-handed vessel

The more exquisite any good is, of which a small specimen is afforded us, the sharper is the evil allied to it, and few exceptions are found to this uniform law of nature The most sprightly wit borders on madness, the highest effusions of joy produce the deepest melancholy, the most flattering hopes make way for the severest disappointments And, in general, no course of life has such safety (for happiness is not to be dreamed of) as the temperate and moderate, which maintains, as far as possible, a mediocrity, and a kind of insensibility, in every thing

The good, the great, the sublime, the ravishing, are found eminently in the genuine principle of theism

The universal propensity to believe in invisible, intelligent power, if not an original instinct, being at least a general attendant of human nature, may be considered as a kind of mark or stamp, which the Divine workman has set upon his work, and nothing surely can more dignify mankind, than to be thus selected from all other parts of the creation, and to bear the image or impression of the Creator

What a noble privilege is it of human reason to attain the knowledge of the Supreme Being, and, from the visible works of nature, be enabled to infer so sublime a principle as its supreme Creator?

Look out for a people entirely destitute of religion if you find them at all, be assured, that they are but few degrees removed from brutes.

What so pure as some of the morals, included in some theological systems?

OF MIRACLES—PART I.

THERE is, in Dr Tillotson's writings, an argument against the *real presence*, which is as concise, and elegant, and strong, as any argument can possibly be supposed against a doctrine, so little worthy of a serious refutation. It is acknowledged on all hands, says that learned prelate, that the authority, either of the Scripture or of tradition, is founded merely on the testimony of the apostles, who were eye witnesses to those miracles of our Saviour by which He proved his divine mission. Our evidence, then, for the truth of the *Christian* religion, is less than the evidence for the truth of our senses; because, even in the first authors of our religion, it was no greater; and it is evident it must diminish in passing from them to their disciples; nor can any one rest such confidence in their testimony, as in the immediate object of his senses. But a weaker evidence can never destroy a stronger; and therefore, were the doctrine of the real presence ever so clearly revealed in Scripture, it were directly contrary to the rules of just reasoning to give our assent to it. It contradicts sense, though both the Scripture and tradition, on which it is supposed to be built, carry not such evidence with them as sense; when they are considered merely as external evidences, and are not brought home to every one's breast by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit.

Nothing is so convenient as a decisive argument of this kind, which must at least *silence* the most arrogant bigotry and superstition and free us from their impertinent solicitations. I flatter myself, that I have discovered an argument of a like nature, which, if just, will, with the wise and learned, be an everlasting check to all kinds of superstitious delusion, and consequently will be useful as long as the world endures. For so long, I presume will the accounts of miracles and prodigies be found in all history, sacred and profane.

Though experience be our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact; it must be acknowledged, that this guide is not altogether infallible, but in some cases is apt to lead us into errors. One who, in our climate, should expect better weather in any week of June than in one of December, would reason justly and conformably to experience; but it is certain, that he may happen, in the event, to find himself mistaken. However, we may observe, that, in such a case, he would have no cause to complain of experience; because it commonly informs us beforehand of the uncertainty, by that contrariety of events, which we may learn from a diligent observation. All effects follow not with like certainty from their supposed causes. Some events

are found, in all countries and all ages, to have been constantly conjoined together: Others are found to have been more variable, and sometimes to disappoint our expectations; so that, in our reasonings concerning matter of fact, there are all imaginable degrees of assurance, from the highest certainty to the lowest species of moral evidence.

A wise man, therefore, proportions his belief to the evidence. In such conclusions as are founded on an infallible experience, he expects the event with the last degree of assurance, and regards his past experience as a full *proof* of the future existence of that event. In other cases, he proceeds with more caution. He weighs the opposite experiments. He considers which side is supported by the greater number of experiments. To that side he inclines, with doubt and hesitation; and when at last he fixes his judgement, the evidence exceeds not what we properly call *probability*. All probability, then, supposes an opposition of experiments and observations, where the one side is found to overbalance the other, and to produce a degree of evidence proportioned to the superiority. A hundred instances or experiments on one side, and fifty on another, afford a doubtful expectation of any event; though a hundred uniform experiments, with only one that is contradictory, reasonably beget a pretty strong degree of assurance. In all cases, we must balance the opposite experiments, where they are opposite, and deduct the smaller number from the greater, in order to know the exact force of the superior evidence.

To apply these principles to a particular instance, we may observe, that there is no species of reasoning more common, more useful, and even necessary to human life, than that which is derived from the testimony of men, and the reports of eye witnesses and spectators. This species of reasoning, perhaps, one may deny to be founded on the relation of cause and effect. I shall not dispute about a word. It will be sufficient to observe, that our assurance in any argument of this kind is derived from no other principle than our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses. It being a general maxim that no objects have any discoverable connection together, and that all the inferences which we can draw from one to another, are founded merely on our experience of their constant and regular conjunction; it is evident, that we ought not to make an exception to this maxim in favour of human testimony, whose connection with any event seems, in itself, as little necessary as any other. Were not the memory tenacious to a certain degree; had not men commonly an inclination to truth and a principle of probity; were they not sensible to shame, when detected in a falsehood: were not these, I say, discovered by *experience* to be qualities inherent in human nature, we should never repose the least confidence in human testimony. A man delirious, or noted for falsehood and villany, has no manner of authority with us.

And as the evidence, derived from witnesses and human testimony, is founded on past experience, so it varies with the experience, and is regarded either as a *proof* or a *probability*, according as the conjunction between any particular kind of report, and any kind of object, has been found to be constant or variable. There are a number of circumstances to be taken into consideration in all judgments of this kind, and the ultimate standard, by which we determine all disputes, that may arise concerning them, is always derived from experience and observation. Where this experience is not entirely uniform on any side, it is attended with an unavoidable contrariety in our judgments, and with the same opposition and mutual destruction of argument as in every other kind of evidence. We frequently hesitate concerning the reports of others. We balance the opposite circumstances which cause any doubt or uncertainty, and when we discover a superiority on any side, we incline to it, but still with a diminution of assurance, in proportion to the force of its antagonist.

This contrariety of evidence, in the present case, may be derived from several different causes, from the opposition of contrary testimony, from the character or number of the witnesses, from the manner of their delivering their testimony, or from the union of all these circumstances. We entertain a suspicion concerning any matter of fact, when the witnesses contradict each other, when they are but few, or of a doubtful character, when they have an interest in what they affirm, when they deliver their testimony with hesitation, or, on the contrary, with too violent asseverations. There are many other particulars of the same kind, which may diminish or destroy the force of any argument derived from human testimony.

Suppose, for instance, that the fact, which the testimony endeavours to establish, partakes of the extraordinary and the marvellous, in that case, the evidence resulting from the testimony admits of a diminution greater or less, in proportion as the fact is more or less unusual. The reason why we place any credit in witnesses and historians, is not derived from any *connection* which we perceive, *à priori*, between testimony and reality, but because we are accustomed to find a conformity between them. But when the fact attested is such a one as has seldom fallen under our observation, here is a contest of two opposite experiences, of which the one destroys the other as far as its force goes, and the superior can only operate on the mind by the force which remains. The very same principle of experience which gives us a certain degree of assurance in the testimony of witnesses, gives us also in this case, another degree of assurance against the fact which they endeavour to establish, from which contradiction there necessarily arises a counterpoise, and mutual destruction of belief and authority.

I should not believe such a story were it told me by Cato, was a proverbial saying in Rome, even during the lifetime of that philosophical

patriot.* The incredibility of a fact, it was allowed, might invalidate so great an authority.

The Indian prince, who refused to believe the first relations concerning the effects of frost, reasoned justly; and it naturally required very strong testimony to engage his assent to facts that arose from a state of nature with which he was unacquainted, and which bore so little analogy to those events of which he had had constant and uniform experience. Though they were not contrary to his experience, they were not conformable to it.†

But in order to increase the probability against the testimony of witnesses, let us suppose, that the fact which they affirm, instead of being only marvellous, is really miraculous; and suppose also, that the testimony, considered apart and in itself, amounts to an entire proof; in that case, there is proof against proof, of which the strongest must prevail, but still with a diminution of its force, in proportion to that of its antagonist.

A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. Why is it more than probable, that all men must die; that lead cannot of itself remain suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood, and is extinguished by water; unless it be, that these events are found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these laws, or in other words, a miracle to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle, if it ever happen in the common course of nature. It is no miracle that a man seemingly in good health should die on a sudden; because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle, that a dead man should come to life; because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must, therefore, be a uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And as an uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full *proof* from the nature of the fact against the

* Plutarch in vita Catonis.

† No Indian, it is evident, could have experience that water did not freeze in cold climates. This is placing nature in a situation quite unknown to him; and it is impossible for him to tell *à priori* what will result from it. It is making a new experiment, the consequence of which is always uncertain. One may sometimes conjecture from analogy what will follow; but still this is but conjecture. And it must be confessed, that, in the present case of freezing, the event follows contrary to the rules of analogy, and is such as a rational Indian would not look for. The operations of cold upon water are not gradual, according to the degrees of cold; but whenever it comes to the freezing point, the water passes in a moment from the utmost liquidity to perfect hardness. Such an event, therefore, may be denominated *extraordinary*, and requires a pretty strong testimony, to render it credible to people in a warm climate. But still it is not *miraculous*, nor contrary to uniform experience of the course of nature, in cases where all the circumstances are the same. The inhabitants of Sumatra have always seen water fluid in their own climate, and the freezing of their rivers ought to be deemed a prodigy. But they never saw water in Muscovy during the winter; and therefore they cannot reasonably be positive what would there be the consequence.

existence of any miracle, nor can such a proof be destroyed, or the miracle rendered credible, but by an opposite proof, which is superior.*

The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention), "That no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish And even in that case there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior" When any one tells me, that he saw a dead man restored to life, I immediately consider with myself, whether it be more probable that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact which he relates should really have happened I weigh the one miracle against the other, and according to the superiority which I discover, I pronounce my decision, and always reject the greater miracle If the falsehood of his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates, then, and not till then, can he pretend to command my belief or opinion

---

OF MIRACLES—PART II

In the foregoing reasoning we have supposed that the testimony, upon which a miracle is founded, may possibly amount to an entire proof, and that the falsehood of that testimony would be a real prodigy But it is easy to show, that we have been a great deal too liberal in our concession and that there never was a miraculous event established on so full an evidence

For, *first*, There is not to be found, in all history, any miracle attested by a sufficient number of men of such unquestioned good sense, education, and learning, as to secure us against all delusion in themselves, of such undoubted integrity, as to place them beyond all suspicion of any design to deceive others, of such credit and reputation

* Sometimes an event may not *in itself, seem* to be contrary to the laws of nature, and yet if it were real it might by reason of some circumstances, be denominated a miracle because in *fact* it is contrary to these laws. Thus if a person claiming a divine authority, should command a sick person to be well, a healthful man to fall down dead, the clouds to pour rain, the winds to blow in short, should order many natural events, which immediately follow upon his command these might justly be esteemed miracles, because they are really, in this case, contrary to the laws of nature For if any suspicion remain that the event and command concurred by accident, there is no miracle and no transgression of the laws of nature. If this suspicion be removed, there is evidently a miracle, and a transgression of these laws, because nothing can be more contrary to nature than that the voice or command of a man should have such an influence. A miracle may be accurately defined, *a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity, or by the interposition of some invisible agent.* A miracle may either be discoverable by men or not. This alters not its nature and essence. The raising of a house or ship into the air is a visible miracle. The raising of a feather, when the wind wants ever so little of a force requisite for that purpose, is as real a miracle, though not so sensible with regard to us.

in the eyes of mankind, as to have a great deal to lose in case of their being detected in any falsehood; and at the same time, attesting facts performed in such a public manner, and in so celebrated a part of the world, as to render the detection unavoidable. All which circumstances are requisite to give us a full assurance in the testimony of men.

Secondly, We may observe in human nature a principle, which, if strictly examined, will be found to diminish extremely the assurance which we might, from human testimony, have in any kind of prodigy. The maxim, by which we commonly conduct ourselves in our reasonings, is, that the objects, of which we have no experience, resemble those of which we have; that what we have found to be most usual is always most probable; and that where there is an opposition of arguments, we ought to give the preference to such as are founded on the greatest number of past observations. But though, in proceeding by this rule, we readily reject any fact which is unusual and incredible in an ordinary degree; yet in advancing farther, the mind observes not always the same rule; but when anything is affirmed utterly absurd and miraculous, it rather the more readily admits of such a fact, upon account of that very circumstance which ought to destroy all its authority. The passion of *surprise* and *wonder*, arising from miracles, being an agreeable emotion, gives a sensible tendency towards the belief of those events from which it is derived. And this goes so far, that even those who cannot enjoy this pleasure immediately, nor can believe those miraculous events of which they are informed, yet love to partake of the satisfaction at second-hand or by rebound, and place a pride and delight in exciting the admiration of others.

With what greediness are the miraculous accounts of travellers received, their descriptions of sea and land monsters, their relations of wonderful adventures, strange men, and uncouth manners? But if the spirit of religion join itself to the love of wonder, there is an end of common sense; and human testimony, in these circumstances, loses all pretensions to authority. A religionist may be an enthusiast, and imagine he sees what has no reality. He may know his narrative to be false, and yet persevere in it with the best intentions in the world, for the sake of promoting so holy a cause. Or even where this delusion has not place, vanity, excited by so strong a temptation, operates on him more powerfully than on the rest of mankind in any other circumstances; and self-interest with equal force. His auditors may not have, and commonly have not, sufficient judgment to canvass his evidence. What judgment they have, they renounce by principle, in these sublime and mysterious subjects. Or if they were ever so willing to employ it, passion and a heated imagination, disturb the regularity of its operations. Their credulity increases his impudence; and his impudence overpowers their credulity.

Eloquence, when at its highest pitch, leaves little room for reason or

reflection; but addressing itself entirely to the fancy or the affections, captivates the willing hearers, and subdues their understanding. Happily, this pitch it seldom attains. But what a Tully or a Demosthenes could scarcely effect over a Roman or Athenian audience, every *Capuchin*, every itinerant or stationary teacher can perform over the generality of mankind, and in a higher degree, by touching such gross and vulgar passions.

The many instances of forged miracles and prophecies, and supernatural events, which, in all ages, have either been detected by contrary evidence, or which detect themselves by their absurdity, prove sufficiently the strong propensity of mankind, to the extraordinary and the marvellous, and ought reasonably to beget a suspicion against all relations of this kind. This is our natural way of thinking, even with regard to the most common and most credible events. For instance, there is no kind of report which rises so easily, and spreads so quickly, especially in country places and provincial towns, as those concerning marriages; insomuch that two young persons of equal condition never see each other twice, but the whole neighbourhood immediately join them together. The pleasure of telling a piece of news so interesting, of propagating it, and of being the first reporters of it, spreads the intelligence. And this is so well known, that no man of sense gives attention to these reports, till he find them confirmed by some greater evidence. Do not the same passions, and others still stronger, incline the generality of mankind to believe and report, with the greatest vehemence and assurance, all religious miracles?

Thirdly, It forms a strong presumption against all supernatural and miraculous relations, that they are observed chiefly to abound among ignorant and barbarous nations; or if a civilized people has ever given admission to any of them, that people will be found to have received them from ignorant and barbarous ancestors, who transmitted them with that inviolable sanction and authority which always attend received opinions. When we peruse the first histories of all nations, we are apt to imagine ourselves transported into some new world; where the whole frame of nature is disjointed, and every element performs its operations in a different manner from what it does at present. Battles, revolutions, pestilence, famine, and death, are never the effect of those natural causes which we experience. Prodigies, omens, oracles, judgments, quite obscure the few natural events that are intermingled with them. But as the former grow thinner every page, in proportion as we advance nearer the enlightened ages, we soon learn, that there is nothing mysterious or supernatural in the case, but that all proceeds from the usual propensity of mankind towards the marvellous, and that though this inclination may at intervals receive a check from sense and learning, it can never be thoroughly extirpated from human nature.

It is strange, a judicious reader is apt to say, upon the perusal of these wonderful historians, *that such prodigious events never happen in our days*. But it is nothing strange, I hope, that men should lie in all ages. You must surely have seen instances now of that frailty. You have yourself heard many such marvellous relations started, which, being treated with scorn by all the wise and judicious, have at last been abandoned even by the vulgar. Be assured, that those renowned lies, which have spread and flourished to such a monstrous height, arose from like beginnings; but being sown in a more proper soil, shot up at last into prodigies almost equal to those which they relate.

It was a wise policy in that false prophet Alexander, who, though now forgotten, was once so famous, to lay the first scene of his impostures in Paphlagonia, where, as Lucian tells us, the people were extremely ignorant and stupid, and ready to swallow even the grossest delusion. People at a distance, who are weak enough to think the matter at all worth inquiry, have no opportunity of receiving better information. The stories come magnified to them by a hundred circumstances. Fools are industrious in propagating the imposture; while the wise and learned are contented, in general, to deride its absurdity, without informing themselves of the particular facts by which it may be distinctly refuted. And thus the impostor above-mentioned was enabled to proceed, from his ignorant Paphlagonians, to the enlisting of votaries, even among the Grecian philosophers, and men of the most eminent rank and distinction in Rome. Nay, could engage the attention of that sage emperor Marcus Aurelius; so far as to make him trust the success of a military expedition to his delusive prophecies.

The advantages are so great, of starting an imposture among an ignorant people, that even though the delusion should be too gross to impose on the generality of them (*which, though seldom, is sometimes the case*), it has a much better chance for succeeding in remote countries, than if the first scene had been laid in a city renowned for arts and knowledge. The most ignorant and barbarous of these barbarians carry the report abroad. None of their countrymen have a large correspondence, or sufficient credit and authority to contradict and beat down the delusion. Men's inclination to the marvellous has full opportunity to display itself. And thus a story, which is universally exploded in the place where it was first started, shall pass for certain at a thousand miles distance. But had Alexander fixed his residence at Athens, the philosophers of that renowned mart of learning had immediately spread, throughout the whole Roman empire, their sense of the matter; which, being supported by so great authority, and displayed by all the force of reason and eloquence, had entirely opened the eyes of mankind. It is true, Lucian, passing by chance through Paphlagonia, had an opportunity of performing this good office. But

though much to be wished, it does not always happen, that every Alexander meets with a Lucian, ready to expose and detect his impostures.

I may add as a *fourth* reason, which diminishes the authority of prodigies, that there is no testimony for any, even those which have not been expressly detected, that is not opposed by an infinite number of witnesses, so that not only the miracle destroys the credit of testimony, but the testimony destroys itself. To make this the better understood, let us consider, that, in matters of religion, whatever is different is contrary, and that it is impossible the religions of Ancient Rome, of Turkey, of Siam, and of China, should, all of them, be established on any solid foundation. Every miracle, therefore, pretended to have been wrought in any of these religions (and all of them abound in miracles), as its direct scope is to establish the particular system to which it is attributed, so has it the same force, though more indirectly, to overthrow every other system. In destroying a rival system, it likewise destroys the credit of those miracles on which that system was established, so that all the prodigies of different religions are to be regarded as contrary facts, and the evidences of these prodigies, whether weak or strong, as opposite to each other. According to this method of reasoning, when we believe any miracle of Mahomet or his successors, we have for our warrant the testimony of a few barbarous Arabians. And, on the other hand, we are to regard the authority of Titus Livius, Plutarch, Tacitus, and, in short, of all the authors and witnesses, Grecian, Chinese, and Roman Catholic, who have related any miracle in their particular religion, I say, we are to regard their testimony in the same light as if they had mentioned that Mahometan miracle, and had in express terms contradicted it, with the same certainty as they have for the miracle they relate. The argument may appear over subtile and refined, but is not in reality different from the reasoning of a judge, who supposes, that the credit of two witnesses, maintaining a crime against any one, is destroyed by the testimony of two others, who affirm him to have been two hundred leagues distant, at the same instant when the crime is said to have been committed.

One of the best attested miracles in all profane history is that which Tacitus reports of Vespasian, who cured a blind man in Alexandria by means of his spittle, and a lame man by the mere touch of his foot, in obedience to a vision of the god Serapis, who had enjoined them to have recourse to the emperor for these miraculous cures. The story may be seen in that fine historian,* where every circumstance seems to add weight to the testimony, and might be displayed at large with all the force of argument and eloquence, if any one were now concerned to enforce the evidence of that exploded and idolatrous

* Hist. lib. v. cap. 8. Suetonius gives nearly the same account in vita Vesp.

superstition. The gravity, solidity, age, and probity of so great an emperor, who, through the whole course of his life, conversed in a familiar manner with his friends and courtiers, and never affected those extraordinary airs of divinity assumed by Alexander and Demetrius. The historian, a contemporary writer, noted for candour and veracity, and withal the greatest and most penetrating genius, perhaps, of all antiquity, and so free from any tendency to credulity, that he even lies under the contrary imputation, of atheism and profaneness. The persons, from whose authority he related the miracle, of established character for judgment and veracity, as we may well presume; eye-witnesses of the fact, and confirming their testimony, after the Flavian family was despoiled of the empire, and could no longer give any reward as the price of a lie. *Utrumque, qui interfuere, nunc quoque memorant, postquam nullum mendacio pretium.* To which if we add the public nature of the facts, as related, it will appear, that no evidence can well be supposed stronger for so gross and so palpable a falsehood.

There is also a memorable story related by Cardinal de Retz, which may well deserve our consideration. When that intriguing politician fled into Spain, to avoid the persecution of his enemies, he passed through Saragossa, the capital of Arragon, where he was shown, in the cathedral, a man, who had served seven years as a door-keeper, and was well known to everybody in town that had ever paid his devotions at that church. He had been seen, for so long a time, wanting a leg; but recovered that limb by the rubbing of holy oil upon the stump; and the cardinal assures us, that he saw him with two legs. This miracle was vouched by all the canons of the church, and the whole company in town were appealed to for a confirmation of the fact; whom the cardinal found, by their zealous devotion, to be thorough believers of the miracle. Here the relater was also contemporary to the supposed prodigy, of an incredulous and libertine character, as well as of great genius; the miracle of so *singular* a nature as could scarcely admit of a counterfeit, and the witnesses very numerous, and all of them in a manner spectators of the fact to which they gave their testimony. And what adds mightily to the force of the evidence, and may double our surprise on this occasion, is, that the cardinal himself, who relates the story, seems not to give any credit to it, and consequently, cannot be suspected of any concurrence in the holy fraud. He considered justly, that it was not requisite, in order to reject a fact of this nature, to be able accurately to disprove the testimony, and to trace its falsehood, through all the circumstances of knavery and credulity which produced it. He knew, that, as this was commonly altogether impossible at any small distance of time and place; so was it extremely difficult, even where one was immediately present, by reason of the bigotry, ignorance, cunning, and roguery of a great part

a miracle. He therefore concluded, like a just reasoner, that such an evidence carried falsehood upon the very face of it, and that a miracle, supported by any human testimony, was more properly a subject of derision than of argument

There surely never was a greater number of miracles ascribed to one person, than those which were lately said to have been wrought in France upon the tomb of Abbé Paris, the famous Jansenist, with whose sanctity the people were so long deluded The curing of the sick, giving hearing to the deaf, and sight to the blind, were everywhere talked of as the usual effects of that holy sepulchre But what is more extraordinary, many of the miracles were immediately proved upon the spot, before judges of unquestioned integrity, attested by witnesses of credit and distinction, in a learned age, and on the most eminent theatre that is now in the world Nor is this all A relation of them was published and dispersed everywhere, nor were the *Jesuits*, though a learned body, supported by the civil magistrate, and determined enemies to those opinions, in whose favour the miracles were said to have been wrought, ever able distinctly to refute or detect them.*

* This book was written by Mons. Montgeron, counsellor or judge of the parliament of Paris a man of figure and character who was also a martyr to the cause and is now said to be somewhere in a dungeon on account of his book

There is another book in three volumes (*Recueil des Miracles de l'Abbé* Paris) giving an account of many of these miracles and accompanied with prefatory discourses which are very well written. There runs however through the whole of these a ridiculous comparison between the miracles of our Saviour and those of the Abbé wherein it is asserted, that the evidence of the latter is equal to that for the former As if the testimony of men could ever be put in the balance with that of God himself, who conducted the pen of the inspired writers If these writers, indeed, were to be considered merely as human testimony the French author is very moderate in his comparison since he might, with some appearance of reason, pretend, that the Jansenist miracles much surpass the other in evidence and authority The following circumstances are drawn from authentic papers, inserted in the above-mentioned book.

Many of the miracles of Abbé Paris were proved immediately by witnesses before the officiality or Bishop's court at Paris under the eye of Cardinal Noailles whose character for integrity and capacity was never contested even by his enemies

His successor in the archbishopric was an enemy to the Jansenists and for that reason promoted to the see by the court. Yet twenty two rectors or *curés* of Paris with infinite earnestness, press him to examine those miracles, which they assert to be known to the whole world and indisputably certain But he wisely forbore

"The Molinist party had tried to discredit these miracles in one instance, that of Mademoiselle le Franc. But, besides that their proceedings were in many respects the most irregular in the world, particularly in citing only a few of the Jansenist witnesses whom they tampered with: Besides this, I say, they soon found themselves overwhelmed by a cloud of new witnesses, one hundred and twenty in number, most of them persons of credit and substance in Paris, who gave oath for the miracle. This was accompanied with a solemn and earnest appeal to the parliament. But the parliament were forbidden by authority to meddle in the affair. It was at last observed, that where men are heated by zeal and enthusiasm there is no degree of human testimony so strong as may not be procured for the greatest absurdity And those who will be so silly as to examine the affair by that medium, and seek particular flaws in the testimony, are almost sure to be confounded. It must be a miserable imposture, indeed, that does not prevail in that contest.

All who have been in France about that time have heard of the reputation of Mons. Heraut, the lieutenant *de Police*, whose vigilance, penetration, activity, and extensive intelligence, have been much talked of. This magistrate, who by the nature of his office is almost absolute, was invested with full powers, on purpose to suppress or discredit these miracles and he frequently seized immediately, and examined the witnesses and subjects of them But never could reach any thing satisfactory against them.

In the case of Mademoiselle Thibaut he sent the famous De Sylva to examine her; whose evidence is very curious. The physician declares, that it was impossible she could have been

Where shall we find such a number of circumstances, agreeing to the corroboration of one fact? And what have we to oppose to such a crowd of witnesses, but the absolute impossibility or miraculous nature of the events which they relate? And this, surely, in the eyes of all reasonable people, will alone be regarded as a sufficient refutation.

Is the consequence just, because some human testimony has the utmost force and authority in some cases, when it relates the battle of Philippi or Pharsalia for instance, that therefore all kinds of testimony must, in all cases, have equal force and authority? Suppose that the Cæsarean and Pompeian factions had, each of them, claimed the victory in these battles, and that the historians of each party had uniformly ascribed the advantage to their own side, how could mankind, at this distance, have been able to determine between them? The contrariety is equally strong between the miracles related by Herodotus or Plutarch, and those delivered by Mariana, Bede, or any monkish historian.

The wise lend a very academic faith to every report which favours

so ill as was proved by witnesses because it was impossible she could in so short a time, have recovered so perfectly as he found her He reasoned like a man of sense, from natural causes but the opposite party told him that the whole was a miracle and that his evidence was the very best proof of it.

The Molinists were in a sad dilemma They durst not assert the absolute insufficiency of human evidence to prove a miracle They were obliged to say that these miracles were wrought by witchcraft and the devil But they were told, that this was the resource of the Jews of old.

No Jansenist was ever embarrassed to account for the cessation of the miracles when the church yard was shut up by the king's edict. It was the touch of the tomb which produced these extraordinary effects and when no one could approach the tomb, no effects could be expected God indeed, could have thrown down the walls in a moment but he is master of his own graces and works and it belongs not to us to account for them. He did not throw down the walls of every city like those of Jericho, on the sounding of the rams horns, nor break up the prison of every apostle like that of St. Paul.

No less a man than the Duc de Chatillon a duke and peer of France, of the highest rank and family, gives evidence of a miraculous cure performed upon a servant of his, who had lived several years in his house with a visible and palpable infirmity

I shall conclude with observing that no clergy are more celebrated for strictness of life and manners than the secular clergy of France particularly the rectors or *curés* of Paris, who bear testimony to these impostures

The learning, genius and probity of the gentlemen and the austerity of the nuns of Port-Royal, have been much celebrated all over Europe. Yet they all give evidence for a miracle, wrought on the niece of the famous Pascal, whose sanctity of life as well as extraordinary capacity is well known The famous Racine gives an account of this miracle in his famous history of Port Royal, and fortifies it with all the proofs which a multitude of nuns, priests, physicians, and men of the world, all of them of undoubted credit, could bestow upon it. Several men of letters particularly the bishop of Tournay thought this miracle so certain, as to employ it in the refutation of atheists and free thinkers The queen regent of France, who was extremely prejudiced against the Port Royal, sent her own physician to examine the miracle, who returned an absolute convert In short the supernatural cure was so incontestible, that it saved, for a time, that famous monastery from the ruin with which it was threatened by the Jesuits. Had it been a cheat, it had certainly been detected by such sagacious and powerful antagonists, and must have hastened the ruin of the contrivers. Our divines, who can build up a formidable castle from such despicable materials; what a prodigious fabric could they have reared from these and many other circumstances, which I have not mentioned! How often would the great names of Pascal, Racine, Arnaud, Nicole, have resounded in our ears? But if they be wise, they had better adopt the miracle, as being more worth, a thousand times, than all the rest of their collection. Besides, it may serve very much to their purpose. For that miracle was really performed by the touch of an authentic holy prickle of the holy thorn, which composed the holy crown, which, &c.

the passion of the reporter, whether it magnifies his country, his family, or himself, or in any other way strikes in with his natural inclinations and propensities. But what greater temptation than to appear a missionary, a prophet, an ambassador from heaven? Who would not encounter many dangers and difficulties, in order to attain so sublime a character? Or if, by the help of vanity and a heated imagination, a man has first made a convert of himself, and entered seriously into the delusion, whoever scruples to make use of pious frauds, in support of so holy and meritorious a cause?

The smallest spark may here kindle into the greatest flame, because the materials are always prepared for it. The *avidum genus auricularum*,* the gazing populace, receive greedily, without examination, whatever soothes superstition, and promotes wonder.

How many stories of this nature, have, in all ages, been detected and exploded in their infancy? How many more have been celebrated for a time, and have afterwards sunk into neglect and oblivion? Where such reports, therefore fly about, the solution of the phenomenon is obvious, and we judge in conformity to regular experience and observation, when we account for it by the known and natural principles of credulity and delusion. And shall we, rather than have recourse to so natural a solution, allow of a miraculous violation of the most established laws of nature?

I need not mention the difficulty of detecting a falsehood in any private or even public history, at the place where it is said to happen, much more when the scene is removed to ever so small a distance. Even a court of judicature with all the authority, accuracy, and judgment which they can employ, find themselves often at a loss to distinguish between truth and falsehood in the most recent actions. But the matter never comes to any issue, if trusted to the common method of altercation and debate and flying rumours, especially when men's passions have taken part on either side.

In the infancy of new religions, the wise and learned commonly esteem the matter too inconsiderable to deserve their attention or regard. And when afterwards they would willingly detect the cheat, in order to undeceive the deluded multitude, the season is now past, and the records and witnesses, which might clear up the matter, have perished beyond recovery.

No means of detection remain, but those which must be drawn from the very testimony itself of the reporters. And these, though always sufficient with the judicious and knowing, are commonly too fine to fall under the comprehension of the vulgar.

Upon the whole then it appears, that no testimony for any kind of miracle has ever amounted to a probability, much less to a proof; and that even supposing it amounted to a proof, it would be opposed by

* Lucret.

another proof, derived from the very nature of the fact which it would endeavour to establish. It is experience only which gives authority to human testimony; and it is the same experience which assures us of the laws of nature. When, therefore, these two kinds of experience are contrary, we have nothing to do but subtract the one from the other, and embrace an opinion, either on one side or the other, with that assurance which arises from the remainder. But according to the principle here explained, this subtraction, with regard to all popular religions, amounts to an entire annihilation; and therefore we may establish it as a maxim, that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle, and make it a just foundation for any such system of religion.

I beg the limitations here made may be remarked, when I say, that a miracle can never be proved, so as to be the foundation of a system of religion. For I own, that otherwise, there may possibly be miracles, or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony; though perhaps it will be impossible to find any such in all the records of history. Thus, suppose all authors, in all languages, agree, that, from the first of January, 1600, there was a total darkness over the whole earth for eight days. Suppose that the tradition of this extraordinary event is still strong and lively among the people: That all travellers, who return from foreign countries, bring us accounts of the same tradition, without the least variation or contradiction: It is evident, that our present philosophers, instead of doubting the fact, ought to receive it as certain, and ought to search for the causes whence it might be derived. The decay, corruption, and dissolution of nature, is an event rendered probable by so many analogies, that any phenomenon which seems to have a tendency towards that catastrophe, comes within the reach of human testimony, if that testimony be very extensive and uniform.

But suppose that all the historians who treat of England should agree, that the first of January, 1600, Queen Elizabeth died; that both before and after her death she was seen by her physicians and the whole court, as is usual with persons of her rank; that her successor was acknowledged and proclaimed by the parliament; and that, after being interred a month, she again appeared, resumed the throne, and governed England for three years: I must confess that I should be surprised at the concurrence of so many odd circumstances, but should not have the least inclination to believe so miraculous an event. I should not doubt of her pretended death, and of those other public circumstances that followed it: I should only assert it to have been pretended, and that it neither was, nor possibly could be real. You would in vain object to me the difficulty, and almost impossibility of deceiving the world in an affair of such consequence: The wisdom and solid judgment of that renowned queen, with the little or no

advantage which she could reap from so poor an artifice: all this might astonish me; but I would still reply, that the knavery and folly of men are such common phenomena, that I should rather believe the most extraordinary events to arise from their concurrence, than admit of so signal a violation of the laws of nature.

But should this miracle be ascribed to any new system of religion, men in all ages have been so much imposed on by ridiculous stories of that kind, that this very circumstance would be a full proof of a cheat and sufficient with all men of sense, not only to make them reject the fact, but even reject it without farther examination. Though the Being, to whom the miracle is ascribed, be in this case Almighty, it does not upon that account become a whit more probable; since it is impossible for us to know the attributes or actions of such a Being, otherwise than from the experience which we have of his productions in the usual course of nature. This still reduces us to past observation, and obliges us to compare the instances of the violation of truth in the testimony of men, with those of the violation of the laws of nature by miracles, in order to judge which of them is most likely and probable. As the violations of truth are more common in the testimony concerning religious miracles, than in that concerning any other matter of fact, this must diminish very much the authority of the former testimony, and make us form a general resolution, never to lend any attention to it, with whatever specious pretence it may be covered.

Lord Bacon seems to have embraced the same principles of reasoning. "We ought (says he) to make a collection or particular history of all monsters and prodigious births or productions, and, in a word, of everything new, rare, and extraordinary in nature. But this must be done with the most severe scrutiny lest we depart from truth. Above all, every relation must be considered as suspicious which depends in any degree upon religion, as the prodigies of Livy. And no less so, everything that is to be found in the writers of natural magic or alchymy, or such authors who seem, all of them, to have an unconquerable appetite for falsehood and fable."*

I am the better pleased with the method of reasoning here delivered, as I think it may serve to confound those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the *Christian Religion* who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. Our most holy religion is founded on *Faith*, not on reason; and it is a sure method of exposing it, to put it to such a trial, as it is by no means fitted to endure. To make this more evident, let us examine those miracles related in Scripture; and not to lose ourselves in too wide a field, let us confine ourselves to such as we find in the *Pentateuch*, which we shall examine according to the principles of these pretended Christians, not as the word or testimony of God himself, but as the production of a mere human writer and

* Nov. Org. lib. ii. aph. 29.

historian Here then we are first to consider a book, presented to us by a barbarous and ignorant people, written in an age when they were still more barbarous, and in all probability long after the facts which it relates, corroborated by no concurring testimony, and resembling those fabulous accounts which every nation gives of its origin. Upon reading this book, we find it full of prodigies and miracles It gives an account of a state of the world and of human nature entirely different from the present Of our fall from that state Of the age of man extended to near a thousand years Of the destruction of the world by a deluge Of the arbitrary choice of one people, as the favourites of heaven, and that people the countrymen of the author Of their deliverance from bondage by prodigies the most astonishing imaginable I desire any one to lay his hand upon his heart, and after a serious consideration declare, whether he thinks that the falsehood of such a book, supported by such a testimony, would be more extraordinary and miraculous than all the miracles it relates, which is, however, necessary to make it be received according to the measures of probability above established

What we have said of miracles may be applied, without any variation, to prophecies, and indeed, all prophecies are real miracles, and, as such only, can be admitted as proofs of any revelation If it did not exceed the capacity of human nature to foretel future events, it would be absurd to employ any prophecy as an argument for a divine mission or authority from heaven So that upon the whole we may conclude, that the *Christian Religion* not only was at first attended with miracles, but even at this day cannot be believed by any reasonable person without one. Mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity And whoever is moved by *Faith* to assent to it, is conscious of a continued miracle in his own person, which subverts all the principles of his understanding, and gives him a determination to believe what is most contrary to custom and experience

---

OF A PARTICULAR PROVIDENCE AND OF A FUTURE STATE.

I WAS lately engaged in conversation with a friend who loves sceptical paradoxes, where, though he advanced many principles of which I can by no means approve, yet as they seem to be curious, and to bear some relation to the chain of reasoning carried on throughout this inquiry, I shall here copy them from my memory as accurately as I can, in order to submit them to the judgment of the reader.

Our conversation began with my admiring the singular good fortune of philosophy, which as it requires entire liberty above all other

privileges, and chiefly flourishes from the free opposition of sentiments and argumentation, received its first birth in an age and country of freedom and toleration, and was never cramped, even in its most extravagant principles, by any creeds, confessions, or penal statutes. For, except the banishment of Protagoras, and the death of Socrates, which last event proceeded partly from other motives, there are scarcely any instances to be met with, in ancient history, of this bigoted jealousy with which the present age is so much infested. Epicurus lived at Athens to an advanced age, in peace and tranquillity. Epicureans* were even admitted to receive the sacerdotal character, and to officiate at the altar, in the most sacred rites of the established religion. And the public encouragement† of pensions and salaries was afforded equally, by the wisest of all the Roman emperors,‡ to the professors of every sect of philosophy. How requisite such kind of treatment was to philosophy, in her early youth, will easily be conceived, if we reflect, that, even at present, when she may be supposed more hardy and robust, she bears with much difficulty the inclemency of the seasons, and those harsh winds of calumny and persecution which blow upon her.

You admire, says my friend, as the singular good fortune of philosophy, what seems to result from the natural course of things, and to be unavoidable in every age and nation. This pertinacious bigotry, of which you complain, as so fatal to philosophy, is really her offspring, who, after allying with superstition, separates himself entirely from the interest of his parent, and becomes her most inveterate enemy and persecutor. Speculative dogmas of religion, the present occasions of such furious dispute, could not possibly be conceived or admitted in the early ages of the world; when mankind, being wholly illiterate, formed an idea of religion more suitable to their weak apprehension, and composed their sacred tenets of such tales chiefly as were the objects of traditional belief, more than of argument or disputation. After the first alarm, therefore, was over, which arose from the new paradoxes and principles of the philosophers; these teachers seem ever after, during the ages of antiquity, to have lived in great harmony with the established superstition, and to have made a fair partition of mankind between them; the former claiming all the learned and wise, the latter possessing all the vulgar and illiterate.

It seems then, say I, that you leave politics entirely out of the question, and never suppose, that a wise magistrate can justly be jealous of certain tenets of philosophy, such as those of Epicurus, which denying a Divine existence, and consequently a providence and a future state, seem to loosen in a great measure the ties of morality, and may be supposed, for that reason, pernicious to the peace of civil society.

‡ Luciani συμπ. ἢ Λαπίθαι. † Id. εὐνοῦχος. * Id. & Dio.

I know, replied he, that in fact these persecutions never, in any age, proceeded from calm reason, or from experience of the pernicious consequences of philosophy; but arose entirely from passion and prejudice. But what if I should advance farther, and assert, that if Epicurus had been accused before the people, by any of the *sycophants* or informers of those days, he could easily have defended his cause, and proved his principles of philosophy to be as salutary as those of his adversaries, who endeavoured, with such zeal, to expose him to the public hatred and jealousy?

I wish, said I, you would try your eloquence upon so extraordinary a topic, and make a speech for Epicurus which might satisfy, not the mob of Athens, if you will allow that ancient and polite city to have contained any mob, but the more philosophical part of his audience, such as might be supposed capable of comprehending his arguments.

The matter would not be difficult, upon such conditions, replied he And if you please, I shall suppose myself Epicurus for a moment, and make you stand for the Athenian people, and shall deliver you such a harangue as will fill all the urn with white beans, and leave not a black one to gratify the malice of my adversaries

Very well Pray proceed upon these suppositions.

I come hither, O ye Athenians! to justify in your assembly what I maintained in my school, and I find myself impeached by furious antagonists, instead of reasoning with calm and dispassionate inquirers. Your deliberations, which of right should be directed to questions of public good, and the interest of the commonwealth, are diverted to the disquisitions of speculative philosophy, and these magnificent, but perhaps fruitless inquiries, take place of your more familiar but more useful occupations But so far as in me lies, I will prevent this abuse. We shall not here dispute concerning the origin and government of worlds. We shall only inquire how far such questions concern the public interest And if I can persuade you, that they are entirely indifferent to the peace of society and security of government, I hope that you will presently send us back to our schools, there to examine, at leisure, the question the most sublime, but, at the same time, the most speculative of all philosophy

The religious philosophers, not satisfied with the tradition of your forefathers, and doctrine of your priests (in which I willingly acquiesce), indulge a rash curiosity, in trying how far they can establish religion upon the principles of reason, and they thereby excite, instead of satisfying, the doubts which naturally arise from a diligent and scrutinous inquiry They paint, in the most magnificent colours, the order, beauty, and wise arrangement of the universe, and then ask, if such a glorious display of intelligence could proceed from the fortuitous concourse of atoms; or if chance could produce what the greatest genius can never sufficiently admire? I shall not examine the justness

of this argument. I shall allow it to be as solid as my antagonists and accusers can desire. It is sufficient, if I can prove from this very reasoning, that the question is entirely speculative, and that, when in my philosophical disquisitions, I deny a providence and a future state, I undermine not the foundations of society, but advance principles, which they themselves, upon their own topics, if they argue consistently, must allow to be solid and satisfactory

You then, who are my accusers, have acknowledged, that the chief or sole argument for a Divine existence (which I never questioned) is derived from the order of nature, where there appear such marks of intelligence and design, that you think it extravagant to assign for its cause, either chance, or the blind and unguided force of matter You allow, that this is an argument drawn from effects to causes From the order of the work, you infer, that there must have been project and forethought in the workman If you cannot make out this point, you allow, that your conclusion fails, and you pretend not to establish the conclusion in a greater latitude than the phenomena of nature will justify These are your concessions. I desire you to mark the consequences

When we infer any particular cause from an effect, we must proportion the one to the other, and can never be allowed to ascribe to the cause any qualities, but what are exactly sufficient to produce the effect A body of ten ounces raised in any scale may serve as a proof, that the counterbalancing weight exceeds ten ounces, but can never afford a reason that it exceeds a hundred If the cause, assigned for any effect, be not sufficient to produce it, we must either reject that cause, or add to it such qualities as will give it a just proportion to the effect. But if we ascribe to it farther qualities, or affirm it capable of producing other effects, we can only indulge the license of conjecture, and arbitrarily suppose the existence of qualities and energies without reason or authority

The same rule holds, whether the cause assigned be brute unconscious matter, or a rational intelligent being If the cause be known only by the effect, we never ought to ascribe to it any qualities beyond what are precisely requisite to produce the effect · Nor can we, by any rules of just reasoning, return back from the cause, and infer other effects from it, beyond those by which alone it is known to us. No one, merely from the sight of one of Zeuxis's pictures, could know, that he was also a statuary or architect, and was an artist no less skilful in stone and marble than in colours. The talents and taste, displayed in the particular work before us, these we may safely conclude the workman to be possessed of. The cause must be proportioned to the effect; and if we exactly and precisely proportion it, we shall never find in it any qualities that point farther, or afford an inference concerning any other design or performance. Such qualities must be somewhat

beyond what is merely requisite for producing the effect which we examine.

Allowing, therefore, the gods to be the authors of the existence or order of the universe, it follows, that they possess that precise degree of power, intelligence, and benevolence, which appears in their workmanship, but nothing farther can ever be proved, except we call in the assistance of exaggeration and flattery to supply the defects of argument and reasoning. So far as the traces of any attributes at present appear, so far may we conclude these attributes to exist. The supposition of farther attributes is mere hypothesis, much more the supposition, that, in distant regions of space or periods of time, there has been, or will be, a more magnificent display of these attributes, and a scheme of administration more suitable to such imaginary virtues. We can never be allowed to mount up from the universe, the effect, to Jupiter, the cause, and then descend downwards, to infer any new effect from that cause, as if the present effects alone were not entirely worthy of the glorious attributes which we ascribe to that deity. The knowledge of the cause being derived solely from the effect, they must be exactly adjusted to each other, and the one can never refer to anything farther, or be the foundation of any new inference and conclusion.

You find certain phenomena in nature. You seek a cause or author. You imagine that you have found him. You afterwards become so enamoured of this offspring of your brain, that you imagine it impossible, but he must produce something greater and more perfect than the present scene of things, which is so full of ill and disorder. You forget, that the superlative intelligence and benevolence are entirely imaginary, or, at least, without any foundation in reason, and that you have no ground to ascribe to him any qualities, but what you see he has actually exerted and displayed in his productions. Let your gods therefore, O philosophers! be suited to the present appearances of nature. And presume not to alter these appearances by arbitrary suppositions, in order to suit them to the attributes, which you so fondly ascribe to your deities.

When priests and poets, supported by your authority, O Athenians! talk of a golden or silver age, which preceded the present state of vice and misery, I hear them with attention and with reverence. But when philosophers, who pretend to neglect authority, and to cultivate reason, hold the same discourse, I pay them not, I own, the same obsequious submission and pious deference. I ask, who carried them into the celestial regions, who admitted them into the council of the gods; who opened to them the book of fate, that they thus rashly affirm, that their deities have executed, or will execute, any purpose beyond what has actually appeared? If they tell me, that they have mounted on the steps or by the gradual ascent of reason, and by drawing inferences

from effects to causes, I still insist, that they have aided the ascent of reason by the wings of imagination; otherwise they could not thus change their manner of inference, and argue from causes to effects; presuming, that a more perfect production than the present world, would be more suitable to such perfect beings as the gods, and forgetting that they have no reason to ascribe to these celestial beings any perfection or any attribute, but what can be found in the present world.

Hence all the fruitless industry to account for the ill appearances of nature, and save the honour of the gods; while we must acknowledge the reality of that evil and disorder with which the world so much abounds. The obstinate and intractable qualities of matter, we are told, or the observance of general laws, or some such reason, is the sole cause, which controlled the power and benevolence of Jupiter, and obliged him to create mankind and every sensible creature so imperfect and so unhappy. These attributes, then, are, it seems, beforehand, taken for granted, in their greatest latitude. And upon that supposition, I own, that such conjectures may, perhaps, be admitted as plausible solutions of the ill phenomena. But still I ask, Why take these attributes for granted; or why ascribe to the cause any qualities but what actually appear in the effect? Why torture your brain to justify the course of nature upon suppositions, which, for aught you know, may be entirely imaginary, and of which there are to be found no traces in the course of nature?

The religious hypothesis, therefore, must be considered only as a particular method of accounting for the visible phenomena of the universe. But no just reasoner will ever presume to infer from it any single fact, and alter or add to the phenomena in any single particular. If you think, that the appearances of things prove such causes, it is allowable for you to draw an inference concerning the existence of these causes. In such complicated and sublime subjects, every one should be indulged in the liberty of conjecture and argument. But here you ought to rest. If you come backward, and arguing from your inferred causes, conclude that any other fact has existed, or will exist, in the course of nature, which may serve as a fuller display of particular attributes; I must admonish you, that you have departed from the method of reasoning attached to the present subject, and have certainly added something to the attributes of the cause beyond what appears in the effect; otherwise you could never, with tolerable sense or propriety, add anything to the effect, in order to render it more worthy of the cause.

Where, then, is the odiousness of that doctrine which I teach in my school, or rather, which I examine in my gardens? Or what do you find in this whole question, wherein the security of good morals, or the peace and order of society, is in the least concerned?

I deny a providence, you say, and supreme governor of the world, who guides the course of events, and punishes the vicious with infamy and disappointment, and rewards the virtuous with honour and success in all their undertakings. But surely, I deny not the course itself of events, which lies open to every one's inquiry and examination. I acknowledge, that, in the present order of things, virtue is attended with more peace of mind than vice, and meets with a more favourable reception from the world. I am sensible, that, according to the past experience of mankind, friendship is the chief joy of human life, and moderation the only source of tranquillity and happiness. I never balance between the virtuous and the vicious course of life; but am sensible, that to a well-disposed mind, every advantage is on the side of the former. And what can you say more, allowing all your suppositions and reasonings? You tell me, indeed, that this disposition of things proceeds from intelligence and design. But whatever it proceeds from, the disposition itself, on which depends our happiness or misery, and consequently our conduct and deportment in life, is still the same. It is still open for me, as well as you, to regulate my behaviour by my experience of past events. And if you affirm, that, while a Divine providence is allowed, and a supreme distributive justice in the universe, I ought to expect some more particular reward of the good, and punishment of the bad, beyond the ordinary course of events; I here find the same fallacy, which I have before endeavoured to detect. You persist in imagining, that, if we grant that Divine existence, for which you so earnestly contend, you may safely infer consequences from it, and add something to the experienced order of nature, by arguing from the attributes which you ascribe to your gods. You seem not to remember that all your reasonings on this subject can only be drawn from effects to causes; and that every argument deduced from causes to effects, must of necessity be a gross sophism; since it is impossible for you to know anything of the cause, but what you have antecedently, not inferred, but discovered to the full, in the effect.

But what must a philosopher think of those vain reasoners, who, instead of regarding the present scene of things as the sole object of their contemplation, so far reverse the whole course of nature, as to render this life merely a passage to something farther; a porch, which leads to a greater, and vastly different building; a prologue, which serves only to introduce the piece, and give it more grace and propriety? Whence do you think, can such philosophers derive their idea of the gods? From their own conceit and imagination, surely. For if they derive it from the present phenomena, it would never point to anything farther, but must be exactly adjusted to them. That the divinity may *possibly* be endowed with attributes, which we have never seen exerted; may be governed by principles of action, which we cannot discover to

be satisfied All this will freely be allowed. But still this is mere *possibility* and hypothesis. We never can have reason to *infer* any attributes, or any principles of action in him, but so far as we know them to have been exerted and satisfied

Are there any marks of a distributive justice in the world? If you answer in the affirmative, I conclude, that, since justice here exerts itself, it is satisfied If you reply in the negative, I conclude, that you have then no reason to ascribe justice, in our sense of it, to the gods If you hold a medium between affirmation and negation, by saying, that the justice of the gods, at present, exerts itself, in part, but not in its full extent I answer, that you have no reason to give it any particular extent, but only so far as you see it *at present* exert itself.

Thus I bring the dispute, O Athenians! to a short issue with my antagonists. The course of nature lies open to my contemplation as well as to theirs The experienced train of events is the great standard, by which we all regulate our conduct Nothing else can be appealed to in the field, or in the senate Nothing else ought ever to be heard of in the school, or in the closet. In vain would our limited understanding break through those boundaries, which are too narrow for our fond imagination While we argue from the course of nature, and infer a particular intelligent cause, which first bestowed, and still preserves order in the universe, we embrace a principle, which is both uncertain and useless. It is uncertain, because the subject lies entirely beyond the reach of human experience It is useless, because our knowledge of this cause being derived entirely from the course of nature, we can never, according to the rules of just reasoning, return back from the cause with any new inference, or, making additions to the common and experienced course of nature, establish any new principles of conduct and behaviour

I observe (said I, finding he had finished his harangue)) that you neglect not the artifice of the demagogues of old, and as you were pleased to make me stand for the people, you insinuate yourself into my favour by embracing those principles, to which, you know, I have always expressed a particular attachment. But allowing you to make experience (as indeed I think you ought) the only standard of our judgment concerning this, and all other questions of fact, I doubt not but, from the very same experience to which you appeal, it may be possible to refute this reasoning, which you have put into the mouth of Epicurus. If you saw, for instance, a half finished building, surrounded with heaps of brick and stone and mortar, and all the instruments of masonry, could you not *infer* from the effect, that it was a work of design and contrivance? And could you not return again, from this inferred cause, to infer new additions to the effect, and conclude, that the building would soon be finished, and receive all the further improvements which art could bestow upon it? If you

saw upon the sea-shore the print of one human foot, you would con-clude, that a man had passed that way, and that he had also left the traces of the other foot, though effaced by the rolling of the sands or inundation of the waters Why then do you refuse to admit the same method of reasoning with regard to the order of nature? Consider the world and the present life only as an imperfect building, from which you can infer a superior intelligence, and arguing from that superior intelligence, which can leave nothing imperfect, why may you not nfer a more finished scheme or plan, which will receive its completion n some distant point of space or time? Are not these methods of easoning exactly similar? And under what pretence can you embrace he one while you reject the other?

The infinite difference of the subjects, replied he, is a sufficient oundation for this difference in my conclusions In works of *human* art and contrivance, it is allowable to advance from the effect to the ause, and returning back from the cause, to form new inferences con-erning the effect, and examine the alterations which it has probably indergone, or may still undergo But what is the foundation of this nethod of reasoning? Plainly this, that man is a being, whom we now by experience, whose motives and designs we are acquainted vith, and whose projects and inclinations have a certain connection nd coherence, according to the laws which nature has established for he government of such a creature When, therefore, we find, that any vork has proceeded from the skill and industry of man, as we are therwise acquainted with the nature of the animal, we can draw a undred inferences concerning what may be expected from him, and hese inferences will all be founded in experience and observation But did we know man only from the single work or production which re examine, it were impossible for us to argue in this manner; because ur knowledge of all the qualities, which we ascribe to him, being in hat case derived from the production, it is impossible they could point anything farther, or be the foundation of any new inference The rint of a foot in the sand can only prove, when considered alone, that ere was some figure adapted to it, by which it was produced But e print of a human foot proves likewise, from our other experience, at there was probably another foot, which also left its impression, ough effaced by time or other accidents Here we mount from the fect to the cause, and descending again from the cause, infer terations in the effect, but this is not a continuation of the same mple chain of reasoning We comprehend in this case a hundred her experiences and observations concerning the *usual* figure and embers of that species of animal, without which this method of gument must be considered as fallacious and sophistical.

The case is not the same with our reasonings from the works of ture. The Deity is known to us only by His productions, and is a

single Being in the universe, not comprehended under any species or genus, from whose experienced attributes or qualities, we can, by analogy, infer any attribute or quality in Him. As the universe shows wisdom and goodness, we infer wisdom and goodness. As it shows a particular degree of these perfections, we infer a particular degree of them, precisely adapted to the effect which we examine. But farther attributes or farther degrees of the same attributes, we can never be authorized to infer or suppose, by any rules of just reasoning. Now, without some such license of supposition, it is impossible for us to argue from the cause, or infer any alteration in the effect beyond what has immediately fallen under our observation. Greater good produced by this Being must still prove a greater degree of goodness. A more impartial distribution of rewards and punishments must proceed from a greater regard to justice and equity. Every supposed addition to the works of nature makes an addition to the attributes of the Author of nature; and consequently, being entirely unsupported by any reason or argument, can never be admitted but as mere conjecture and hypothesis.*

The great source of our mistake in this subject, and of the unbounded license of conjecture which we indulge, is, that we tacitly consider ourselves as in the place of the Supreme Being, and conclude, that He will, on every occasion, observe the same conduct, which we ourselves, in his situation, would have embraced as reasonable and eligible. But, besides that the ordinary course of nature may convince us, that almost everything is regulated by principles and maxims very different from ours; besides this, I say, it must evidently appear contrary to all rules of analogy to reason, from the intentions and projects of men, to those of a Being so different, and so much superior. In human nature, there is a certain experienced coherence of designs and inclinations; so that when, from any fact, we have discovered one intention of any man, it may often be reasonable, from experience, to infer another, and draw a long chain of conclusions concerning his past or future conduct. But this method of reasoning can never have place with regard to a Being so remote and incomprehensible, who bears much less analogy

* In general, it may, I think, be established as a maxim, that where any cause is known only by its particular effects, it must be impossible to infer any new effects from that cause; since the qualities, which are requisite to produce these new effects along with the former, must either be different, or superior, or of more extensive operation than those which simply produced the effect, whence alone the cause is supposed to be known to us. We can never, therefore, have any reason to suppose the existence of these qualities. To say, that the new effects proceed only from a continuation of the same energy, which is already known from the first effects, will not remove the difficulty. For even granting this to be the case (which can seldom be supposed), the very continuation and exertion of a like energy (for it is impossible it can be absolutely the same), I say, this exertion of a like energy, in a different period of space and time, is a very arbitrary supposition, and what there cannot possibly be any traces of it in the effects, from which all our knowledge of the cause is originally derived. Let the [illegible] cause be exactly proportioned (as it should be) to the known effect; and it is impossible that it can possess any qualities, from which new or different effects can be inferred.

to any other being in the universe than the sun to a waxen taper; and who discovers himself only by some faint traces or outlines, beyond which we have no authority to ascribe to him any attribute or perfection. What we imagine to be a superior perfection, may really be a defect Or were it ever so much a perfection, the ascribing of it to the Supreme Being, where it appears not to have been really exerted to the full in his works, savours more of flattery and panegyric than of just reasoning and sound philosophy All the philosophy, therefore, in the world, and all the religion, which is nothing but a species of philosophy, will never be able to carry us beyond the usual course of experience, or give us measures of conduct and behaviour different from those which are furnished by reflections on common life No new fact can ever be inferred from the religious hypothesis, no event foreseen or foretold, no reward or punishment expected or dreaded beyond what is already known by practice and observation, so that my apology for Epicurus will still appear solid and satisfactory nor have the political interests of society any connection with the philosophical disputes concerning metaphysics and religion

There is still one circumstance, replied I, which you seem to have overlooked. Though I should allow your premises, I must deny your conclusion You conclude, that religious doctrines and reasonings *can* have no influence on life, because they *ought* to have no influence, never considering, that men reason not in the same manner you do, but draw many consequences from the belief of a Divine Existence, and suppose that the Deity will inflict punishments on vice, and bestow rewards on virtue, beyond what appear in the ordinary course of nature, Whether this reasoning of theirs be just or not, is no matter Its influence on their life and conduct must still be the same · And those who attempt to disabuse them of such prejudices, may, for aught I know, be good reasoners, but I cannot allow them to be good citizens and politicians, since they free men from one restraint upon their passions, and make the infringement of the laws of society, in one respect, more easy and secure.

After all, I may, perhaps, agree to your general conclusion in favour of liberty, though upon different premises from those on which you endeavour to found it I think, that the state ought to tolerate every principle of philosophy, nor is there an instance, that any government has suffered in its political interests by such indulgence. There is no enthusiasm among philosophers, their doctrines are not very alluring to the people, and no restraint can be put upon their reasonings, but what must be of dangerous consequence to the sciences, and even to the state, by paving the way for persecution and oppression in points where the generality of mankind are more deeply interested and concerned.

But there occurs to me (continued I), with regard to your main topic,

a difficulty which I shall just propose to you, without insisting on it, lest it lead into reasonings of too nice and delicate a nature. In a word, I much doubt whether it be possible for a cause to be known only by its effect (as you have all along supposed) or to be of so singular and particular a nature, as to have no parallel and no similarity with any other cause or object that has ever fallen under our observation. It is only when two *species* of objects are found to be constantly conjoined, that we can infer the one from the other, and were an effect presented which was entirely singular, and could not be comprehended under any known *species*, I do not see that we could form any conjecture or inference at all concerning its cause. If experience and observation and analogy be, indeed, the only guides which we can reasonably follow in inferences of this nature, both the effect and cause must bear a similarity and resemblance to other effects and causes which we know, and which we have found, in many instances, to be conjoined with each other. I leave it to your own reflection to pursue the consequences of this principle. I shall just observe, that as the antagonists of Epicurus always suppose the universe, an effect quite singular and unparalleled, to be the proof of a Deity, a cause no less singular and unparalleled, your reasonings, upon that supposition, seem, at least, to merit our attention. There is, I own, some difficulty how we can ever return from the cause to the effect, and, reasoning from our ideas of the former, infer any alteration on the latter, or any addition to it.

OF SUPERSTITION AND ENTHUSIASM

THAT *the corruption of the best things produces the worst*, is grown into a maxim, and is commonly proved, among other instances, by the pernicious effects of *superstition* and *enthusiasm*, the corruptions of true religion.

These two species of false religion, though both pernicious, are yet of a very different, and even of a contrary nature. The mind of man is subject to certain unaccountable terrors and apprehensions, proceeding either from the unhappy situation of private or public affairs, from ill health, from a gloomy and melancholy disposition, or from the concurrence of all these circumstances. In such a state of mind, infinite unknown evils are dreaded from unknown agents; and where real objects of terror are wanting, the soul, active to its own prejudice, and fostering its predominant inclination, finds imaginary ones, to whose power and malevolence it sets no limits. As these enemies are

entirely invisible and unknown, the methods taken to appease them are equally unaccountable, and consist in ceremonies, observances, mortifications, sacrifices, presents, or in any practice, however absurd or frivolous, which either folly or knavery recommends to a blind and terrified credulity Weakness, fear, melancholy, together with ignorance, are, therefore, the true sources of Superstition

But the mind of man is also subject to an unaccountable elevation and presumption, arising from prosperous success, from luxuriant health, from strong spirits, or from a bold and confident disposition. In such a state of mind, the imagination swells with great, but confused conceptions, to which no sublunary beauties or enjoyments can correspond Everything mortal and perishable vanishes as unworthy of attention And a full range is given to the fancy in the invisible regions or world of spirits, where the soul is at liberty to indulge itself in every imagination which may best suit its present taste and disposition. Hence arise raptures, transports, and surprising flights of fancy, and, confidence and presumption still increasing, these raptures, being altogether unaccountable, and seeming quite beyond the reach of our ordinary faculties, are attributed to the immediate inspiration of that Divine Being, who is the object of devotion. In a little time, the inspired person comes to regard himself as a distinguished favourite of the Divinity, and when this frenzy once takes place, which is the summit of enthusiasm, every whimsy is consecrated Human reason, and even morality, are rejected as fallacious guides And the fanatic madman delivers himself over, blindly and without reserve, to the supposed illapses of the spirit, and to inspiration from above Hope, pride, presumption, a warm imagination, together with ignorance, are therefore the true sources of Enthusiasm

These two species of false religion might afford occasion to many speculations, but I shall confine myself, at present, to a few reflections concerning their different influence on government and society

My first reflection is, *That superstition is favourable to priestly power, and enthusiasm not less or rather more contrary to it than sound reason and philosophy* As superstition is founded on fear, sorrow, and a depression of spirits, it represents the man to himself in such despicable colours, that he appears unworthy, in his own eyes, of approaching the Divine presence, and naturally has recourse to any other person, whose sanctity of life, or perhaps impudence and cunning, have made him be supposed more favoured by the Divinity To him the superstitious entrust their devotions To his care they recommend their prayers, petitions, and sacrifices And by his means they hope to render their addresses acceptable to their incensed Deity Hence the origin of Priests, who may justly be regarded as an invention of a timorous and abject superstition, which, ever diffident of itself, dares not offer up its own devotions, but ignorantly thinks

o recommend itself to the Divinity by the mediation of his supposed riends and servants. As superstition is a considerable ingredient in lmost all religions, even the most fanatical, there being nothing but hilosophy able entirely to conquer these unaccountable terrors; hence proceeds, that in almost every sect of religion there are priests to be ound. But the stronger mixture there is of superstition, the higher is he authority of the priesthood.

On the other hand, it may be observed, that all enthusiasts have een free from the yoke of ecclesiastics, and have expressed great ndependence in their devotion, with a contempt of forms, ceremoies, and traditions. The *Quakers* are the most egregious, though, at he same time, the most innocent enthusiasts that have yet been nown, and are, perhaps, the only sect that have never admitted riests amongst them. The *Independents*, of all the English sectaries, pproach nearest to the *Quakers* in fanaticism, and in their freedom om priestly bondage. The *Presbyterians* follow after, at an equal istance in both particulars. In short, this observation is founded in xperience, and will also appear to be founded in reason, if we consider, that, as enthusiasm arises from a presumptuous pride and onfidence, it thinks itself sufficiently qualified to *approach* the Divinity without any human mediator. Its rapturous devotions are o fervent, that it even imagines itself *actually* to *approach* Him by he way of contemplation and inward converse, which makes it eglect all those outward ceremonies and observances, to which the ssistance of the priests appears so requisite in the eyes of their upersitious votaries. The fanatic consecrates himself, and bestows n his own person a sacred character, much superior to what forms nd ceremonious institutions can confer on any other.

My *second* reflection with regard to these species of false religion is, *that religions, which partake of enthusiasm, are, on their first rise, more furious and violent than those which partake of superstition, but in a little time become more gentle and moderate.* The violence of his species of religion, when excited by novelty, and animated by pposition, appears from numberless instances, of the *Anabaptists* in ermany, the *Camisars* in France, the *Levellers* and other fanatics in ngland and the *Covenanters* in Scotland. Enthusiasm being unded on strong spirits, and a presumptuous boldness of character, naturally begets the most extreme resolutions, especially after it ses to that height as to inspire the deluded fanatic with the opinion f divine illuminations, and with a contempt for the common rules of ason, morality, and prudence.

It is thus enthusiasm produces the most cruel disorders in human ciety, but its fury is like that of thunder and tempest, which exhaust emselves in a little time, and leave the air more calm and serene an before. When the first fire of enthusiasm is spent, men naturally,

in all fanatical sects, sink into the greatest remissness and coolness in sacred matters, there being no body of men among them, endowed with sufficient authority, whose interest is concerned to support the religious spirit. No rites, no ceremonies, no holy observances, which may enter into the common train of life, and preserve the sacred principles from oblivion. Superstition, on the contrary, steals in gradually and insensibly, renders men tame and submissive, is acceptable to the magistrate, and seems inoffensive to the people. Till at last the priest, having firmly established his authority, becomes the tyrant and disturber of human society, by his endless contentions, persecutions, and religious wars. How smoothly did the Romish church advance in her acquisition of power? But into what dismal convulsions did she throw all Europe, in order to maintain it? On the other hand, our sectaries, who were formerly such dangerous bigots, are now become very free reasoners, and the *Quakers* seem to approach nearly the only regular body of *Deists* in the universe, the *Literati*, or the disciples of Confucius in China.*

My *third* observation on this head is, *That superstition is an enemy to civil liberty, and enthusiasm a friend to it*. As superstition groans under the dominion of priests, and enthusiasm is destructive of all ecclesiastical power, this sufficiently accounts for the present observation. Not to mention, that enthusiasm, being the infirmity of bold and ambitious tempers, is naturally accompanied with a spirit of liberty, as superstition, on the contrary, renders men tame and abject, and fits them for slavery. We learn from English history, that during the civil wars the *Independents* and *Deists*, though the most opposite in their religious principles, yet were united in their political ones, and were alike passionate for a commonwealth. And since the origin of *Whig* and *Tory*, the leaders of the *Whigs* have either been *Deists* or professed *Latitudinarians* in their principles, that is, friends to toleration, and indifferent to any particular sect of *Christians*. While the sectaries, who have all a strong tincture of enthusiasm, have always, without exception, concurred with that party in defence of civil liberty. The resemblance in their superstitions long united the high-church *Tories* and the *Roman Catholics*, in support of prerogative and kingly power, though experience of the tolerating spirit of the *Whigs* seems of late to have reconciled the *Catholics* to that party.

The *Molinists* and *Jansenists* in France have a thousand unintelligible disputes, which are not worthy the reflection of a man of sense: But what principally distinguishes these two sects, and alone merits attention, is the different spirit of their religion. The *Molinists*, conducted by the *Jesuits*, are great friends to superstition, rigid observers of

* The Chinese Literati have no priests or ecclesiastical establishment.

external forms and ceremonies, and devoted to the authority of the priests, and to tradition. The *Jansenists* are enthusiasts, and zealous promoters of the passionate devotion, and of the inward life, little influenced by authority, and, in a word, but half Catholics The consequences are exactly conformable to the foregoing reasoning The *Jesuits* are the tyrants of the people, and the slaves of the court And the *Jansenists* preserve alive the small sparks of the love of liberty, which are to be found in the French nation.

These Essays are generally omitted in popular editions of the writings of Hume. But they are so characteristic of his mode of reasoning and his subtle method of suggesting more than he chooses to say openly that the student is deprived by these omissions of very important material for estimating the intellectual character of the writer and understanding his method of reasoning In the essay on 'Miracles" for instance the concluding sentences contain a double meaning,—word which, in their literal rendering would seem to express the highest appreciation of faith, as an enlightener of the understanding partially concealing a contemptuous sneer at the believer in revealed religion. In the essay on A Particular Providence and a Future State, he puts arguments which are evidently his own into the mouth of a supposed opponent, in discussion who, of course, has a very easy dialectical victory

The publication of these Essays has no doubt been avoided from a fear that the great literary talent of the writer should mislead the judgment of the reader and so induce scepticism, if not open infidelity But it seems to be a better course to allow the arguments to be fairly brought into daylight, as their enforced suppression might induce a suspicion that they were really unanswerable, and thereby weaken the very cause we may be most anxious to sustain We advise our readers carefully to examine the arguments of the writer and not hurriedly to take for granted all that he assumes to be universally admitted as axioms. His leading arguments are—first that all our knowledge is derived from experience, and that, so derived it is a sufficient test by which to try evidence secondly that we should inquire whether it is more probable that a certain remarkable and unprecedented event occurred, or that a number of people, on whose testimony we are asked to receive it, were deceived and thirdly that the laws of nature are fixed and unchangeable, and therefore a miracle, or act performed in opposition to those laws, is simply impossible. In relation to the first basis on which Hume relies it should be remembered that before we can depend upon our experimental knowledge as an absolute and unerring test, it must be proved that it is a complete knowledge having cognisance of all conceivable possibilities, that nothing remains to be known, which might make one side of the evidence stronger and the other weaker As to the second point, the relative probability of any given event, and of deception on the part of witnesses, that involves possibility as well as probability The first question is, was the event supposed to one possible to have taken place? If possible, it must have been in accordance with some power exerted—a power of which we know the existence, but not the nature—and as the power if in existence may be exerted at one time as well as another the question of probability disappears and the investigation is linked to the inquiry whether the event did or did not occur The third basis on which Hume relies that the laws of nature afford the strongest argument against miracles, we will state in his own words. "A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined." In other words, a miracle is an impossibility because it is a miracle—exactly what it is described to be. The truth is that unalterable experience is an absurdity in terms. Our experience, and the knowledge gained from it to-day may and no doubt will, be altered by the fresh knowledge we acquire from the new experience of to-morrow Again, our experience has not "established" these laws. We rely on those laws which we have ourselves defined as the best explanation we can find of phenomena and as these phenomena recur with regularity, we assume that the laws are in constant operation, but we cannot logically infer that they will remain so. Hume was well acquainted with physical science as known in his day. Had he lived a few years longer he might, from the knowledge, for instance, of the correlation of electricity and magnetism, and other cognate facts, have seen reason to modify his conception of unalterable laws.

A somewhat remarkable contradiction in the course of Hume's argument remains to be noticed. He assumes that the ready belief accorded to stories of miracles is due to the fact that they were related to the ignorant and unintellectual—"What a Tully or a Demosthenes

could scarcely effect over a Roman or Athenian audience, every Capuchin, every itinerant or stationary teacher can perform over the generality of mankind "—"marvellous relations which, being treated with scorn by all the wise and judicious, have at last been abandoned even by the vulgar." Yet he afterwards tells us that the impostor, Alexandria, who pretended to witness most marvellous things in Paphlagonia, found believers among the Grecian philosophers men of the most eminent rank and distinction in Rome, and that even "the sage Emperor Marcus Aurelius trusted the success of a military expedition to his delusive prophecies."

We should remember also what Hume appears to have ignored, that our belief in the truth of Christianity does not necessarily depend upon a belief in the recorded miracles, which are not the foundation of the edifice. They were sometimes arguments addressed to individuals to show the power of Jesus they were more frequently acts of mercy and kindness. Spiritual religion, faith hope, and charity, have other bases and even if Christ had not healed the sick and raised the dead He would have been none the less the Divine Teacher and the Saviour.

As we have before noted the dialogue form of the essay on a Divine Providence allows the speaker to have all his own way in the argument and as both sides are not heard, we may very properly decline to give the judgment in his favour he appears to desire.

INDEX.

ABASEMENT, not the natural consequence of Polytheism, 539 Abstraction, what it is, 91, Note.
Achæans, employed Force in Forming their League, 275. — their Number, 255
Addison, Joseph, quoted, 51, 390
Æschynes quoted, 193, 260 — Socrates quoted, 500. Ætolians their Number, 255.
Agathocles, the Tyrant, his Cruelty Note, 240, 308 Agreeableness, a Source of Merit, 456 — to Ourself, 456 — to Others, 463 Agriculture, how best encouraged, 153 154, 246.
Alcoran, its Ethics, 135. Alexander the Great his Saying to Parmenio 457 — his Toleration, 537 — his Emulation of Bacchus, 539 Alexandria its Size and Number of Inhabitants, 258 Allegiance its Obligation, whence 279 Allegory has naturally place in Polytheism, 527
Anacreon quoted, 509. Analogies, the sometimes slight, have Influence, in and risprudence, 424, 493 Anaxagoras, Ju first Theist, and the first accused of Atheism, 526, Note Angels, modern, the Deities of the Philosophers, 527 Animals, their Reason, 371 Antioch its Size, 258 Antipater, the Cyrenian, his Saying 103
Appian Alexandrinus quoted, 193, 220 233, 236, 238, 240 243, 249, 264, 505
Arnobius quoted, 524, 529 Ariosto quoted 57 his Character, 137 Aristides the Sophist quoted, Note, 257 Aristocracy Polish Venetian, in what respects different 15 Aristophanes not impious according to the deas of Antiquity, 524 — quoted, 230 Aristotle quoted 126, 228 230, 76, 498, 519, Note Armstrong, Dr quoted, 498 Arrian quoted, 74 207 245, 537, 540
Atheism, whether possible, 374 Athenæus quoted, 251, 252, 253. Athens, 54, 151, 193, 242, 251, 252, 274 Athenians, on what they chiefly valued themselves, 462 Athenian Man of Merit 501
Augustine (Saint) his Dogmatism, 544 Augustus, his Impiety mixed with Superstition, 525 — his gross Superstition 544 his Age compared with that of Camillus, 152 Aunoi, Madame, quoted, 111 Aurelius Marcus, his Theism, 527 his Superstition, 546. Austria, House of, Causes of its Decay, 202 Authority of Teachers, useful to check it, 70

Bacon, quoted, 35, 52, 123, 157, 437, 530. Balance of Power, 85 199. — Of Trade, 184. — Of Property 85, 32. Banks and Paper Credit, whether advantageous, 168, 184. Bartoli's Plans of ancient Buildings, 257. Bayle quoted, 539.
Beauty, why the object of Pride, 393. Belief, what 337 Bellarmine, Cardinal, his Saying 539. Benevolence, 49. — Disinterested zeal, 484 — its kinds 486 — a Virtue, 411 — from its Utility, 413 — from its Agreeableness, 461 Bentivoglio quoted, 124. Berkeley, Dr, 90, Note — quoted, 123 Berne, the Canton of its Treasure 193
Boccace quoted, 104. Boileau quoted, 458 Bolingbroke, Lord, quoted 51, 30. Boulainvilliers quoted, 532
Brasidas Saying of, 540. Brumoy, 524.

Cæsar quoted 236 264, — Note 524 — his Account of the Number slaughtered in his Wars 249 Note Cambyses, his Extravagance, 541 Capitolinus quoted, 282 Carlisle, Earl of, quoted 77 Cartes, Des, quoted, 145 351, Note Carthage, its Size and Number of its Inhabitants, 261 Carthaginians, their human Sacrifices, 269 Note Catholics led into Absurdities, 542 Cato de re rustica, quoted, 231 — of Utica his speech to Cæsar, 161 Cause and Effect its Ideas whence 322, 327 Its Definition Note, 354 Causes moral how far they contribute to national Characters 117 — physical how far, 123 Causation a Reason of Association, 321 339 Cavalier Party 43
Cervantes his Merit, 202 — quoted, 113.
Chance what, 347 its influence in Society, 64 Characters national 117 Charles XII of Sweden, his Character, 462 Chastity its Merit whence, 431 Cheerfulness its Merit whence, 456. China, its Excellence and Defects 70 Cicero quoted, 16, 53 56, 57 58 103, 206, 227, 239 245 251, 57, 266 268 Note, 275, 412, 414, 440 510, 543 544, 547 552. City, Reasons which limit the greatness of every City 261 Cleanliness its Merit, 466 Clergy, why no Friends to Liberty, 41
Cold, greater in ancient Times 261, 262. Colonesi and Orsini, Parties in Modern Rome 36. Columella quoted, 183, 226, 229, 232, 237, 263, 266, 223, Note Comitia centuriata et tributa, their different Powers 220 Commerce its Advantages 151 foreign its advantages, 155, 156. Commonwealth, perfect Idea of it, 298. Companionable Qualities, 463. Comparison, its Effect, 40, necessary to forming the taste, 142 Comte, Pere le, quoted, 524 Conde, Prince of, a Saying of his, 69. Congreve, his Character, 114. Conjunction frequent, constant, the only circumstance from which we know cause and effect, 350, 352, 355. Connection necessary, our idea of it, 343. Constantine, Emperor his Innovations, 526. Constitution, British, 21 23. Contiguity, a Reason of Association, 329, 337. Contrast,

Original, 292. Conventions, whether the Source of Justice, 49 Conviction, strongest, but not more general, in Theism, 541, 542. Corn distributed in Rome, 257, 258 Corneille, Character of, 114. Corpus juris civilis quoted, 239, 253, Note Courage, how far National, 125 — merit, whence, 459. Country Party, 22, 41, 42
Creation or Formation of the World enters not into the primitive Religion, 527 Credit, public, its Abuses, 207, 208
Curtius, Quintus, quoted, 126, 207, 258 Note, 523, 529. Custom or Habit the source of experimental Reasoning, 333. — the great Guide of Life, 334. Customs, some remarkable ones, 217
Cyrus boasts of his Drunkenness, 126.

Darius Hystaspes records his Ability in drinking on his Tombstone, 126. Datames, the only Barbarian a General, 163
Decency, its Merit whence, 466 Debt, public its advantages, 209 — its disadvantages, 209 210 Delicacy of Passion, how hurtful 9. — of Taste, how advantageous, 9, 10, 11, what it is, 139 whence its Merit, 462. Democracy without a Representative, hurtful 14 15. Demosthenes his Character 60 quoted, 60, 193, 200 217, 218, 227 230, 236 245 252, 261, Note 242. Desire Aversion 394
Diodorus Siculus his Character, 221, Note. — Superstitious, yet not a Theist 525. — Quoted 126 152, 193, 200 236 237, 240, 241 242, 244 245, 246, 248, 250, 251 254 255, 258, 262, Note 264 Note 269, Note, 308, 414 522, 524, 525, 550 552. Diogenes Laertius quoted, 248, 529. — the Cynic, his Character 222, 223 Dion Cassius quoted, 184 Dionysius Halycarnassæus quoted, 215 Note, 113, 521, 527 — the Tyrant his Massacres, 240. — his Army, 152, 250. Discretion, its Merit, whence 460 Division of Property useful 237
Domestic Situation of Ancients and Moderns, 225, 226 Dorians and Ionians, 125.
Dryden, John quoted 118, 543.
Dubos, Abbe, quoted, 128, 187, 261, 267

Eclectics, the, a Sect, 71
Egyptians, why Persecutors, 537 Egyptian Religion, a Difficulty in it, 544. — and Jewish resembling 543.
Eloquence, the value of, 55.
Empires, great, are destructive, 204.
Energy, its Idea 344, 345. English, their national Character, whence, 122. Envy, whence it arises, 399.
Epaminondas, his Character, 453, Note. Epictetus, his Idea of Virtue, 499, his superstition, 546. Epicurus, why he took himself to Philosophy, 526
Ergastula, very frequent anciently, 226.
Euclid treats not of the Beauty of the Circle, 97 Euripides quoted, 522. Europe, its Advantages from its Situation, 71
Evidence, natural and moral, appear to be of the same kind, 367.
Exchange helps to keep the Balance of Trade, 186, — difficult to know, whether for or against a Nation, 199. Exiles in

Greece, how numerous, 244. Experience, Source of all our Reasoning with regard to Fact, 323. — why we reason from Experience, 327, 329. — often the same with what we call Reason, 334, Note, the Exposing of Children 234, approved of by Seneca, ibid.

Fact, Matters of, one Object of Reason, 322. Factions, violent and bloody, among the Ancients, 239 Fairies modern, equivalent to the vulgar Deities of Antiquity, 523. Fame, why desired, 394
Fenelon, Abp. the Ethics of, 134.
Flattery, its influence in Religion, 531. Florus quoted 233. Flux and Reflux of Theism and Polytheism, 535.
Fontaine, la, Mons., quoted, 512. Fontenelle Censure of his Pastorals, 115 — quoted 11 103, 129, 487, 524.
French Man of Merit, 455 — their first question with regard to a stranger, 463. Fregusi and Adorni, Parties of Genoa 36. Frugality whence, 449.
Funding, the dangerous Tendency of, 208.

Gallantry of Civility, 75. Gamesters and Sailors why superstitious, 521 Gaul, Number of its Inhabitants, 264.
Gee Mr quoted, 184. General Rules, their influence, 299, 431 Genoa, its Government and Bank, 20. Getes, immortal, their Faith, 534. Georgius Leontinus, his Eloquence, 60, Note.
Golden Age not susceptible of Justice, 419. Good Sense, how far essential to Taste, 143 Government origin of, 26. Perpetual Struggle between Authority and Liberty in all Governments, 27 Violent Innovations dangerous to Government. 277 Sometimes prove happy in the Issue instanced in the Reign of Henry VIII and Charles I, 278.
Greece its Advantages from its Situation, 71 its whole Military Force, 256. — Numbers of its Inhabitants, 263. Grotius quoted, 492, Note.
Guelf and Ghibelline Parties, 37 Guicciardin quoted, 162. Gustavus Vasa, 41

Hardouin, Pere, 258 Harrington's Oceana censured, 300. — quoted, 32, 52, 299.
Heliogabalus, a conic Stone, 529. Henry IV of France, his Character, 460 — a Saying of his, 216, Note, Henry the IVth and VIIth of England, their Title, 275 Helvetia, its Inhabitants, 265. — Hereditary Right, how important, 292. Heresy Appellation rests commonly on the Side of Reason Examples, 540. Hero-worship, 528. Herodian quoted, 258, 265. Herodotus quoted, 245, 251, 255, 459, 524, 534. 537 Hertha, Goddess of the Saxons, 530 Hesiod, not a Theist properly speaking, 525. — Inconsistency in his Theology, 533. — quoted, 231, 525, 528, 533, 539, Note.
Hiero, King of Syracuse, his Policy, [illegible] Hirtius quoted, 240.
Homer his character, 138. His Ethics, [illegible] Inconsistency of his Theology, [illegible] quoted, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Hoshod, canonical Books of ancient Paganism, 525 Honesty the best Policy 477 Hope and Fear defended, 385, 386 Horace quoted, 52, 66, 74, 78, 114, 147, 229, 261, 546, Note, 388, 438, 500, 509 Hostis, its Signification in old Latin, 152, Human Life, general Idea of it, 107 — Nature, its dignity, 45 Humility, its Causes, 390. Husbandmen, what Proportion they bear to Manufacturers, 151 Hutchinson, Mr quoted, 214
Hyde de Religione veterum Persarum, quoted, 524, 537.

Ideas, their Association 319, 337 — Their Origin, 316. Idolatry, draws its Origin from Polytheism, 528.
Ignorance of Causes were the Origin of Polytheism, 520
Immaculate Conception, a popular Opinion, 532 Impressions what, 316
Incest, whence its Crime, 431 Industry, its Merit, whence, 449 Instructions to Members, 25. Interest, private, how far the foundation of Government, 18 public, ibid Interest, its Lowness, whence, 177, useful to society 180
Ionians and Dorians, Tribes of Greeks, 125.
Iphicrates, a Saying of his 465
Irish, their Idea of Merit, 459.
Isocrates quoted, 230, 241, 242,
Italians Cause of their Effeminacy, 163. Italy, ancient and modern, the Number of its Inhabitants, 266.

Joy Grief, explained, 385 Note
Julian quoted, 249 Justice Source of its Merit, 416,—farther explained, 489 Justin, quoted, 256, 266. Justinian quoted, 78 Juvenal quoted, 74, 124, 233, 262, 267

Lampridius quoted, 248 Laws of the Twelve Tables, 66 Laws of Justice, whence derived, 422 — Of Nature, 429
Louis XIV Numbers of his Armies, 162
Liberty and Necessity a Dispute of Words, 356. Liberty civil, its Advantages, 50, 66, 67 Liberty of the Press, why peculiar to Great Britain, 12, 13. Lipsius, Justus, quoted, 231 Livy, a sincere Religionist, quoted, 21, 37, 121, 152, 193, 198, 236, 240, 246, 499, 549
Locke, Mr, quoted, 52, 283 341, 346 389, 319, Note, 351, Note. Longinus quoted, 57, 59, 457, 524 Lovestein Party in Holland, 42. Love and Hatred, whence, 398
Lucan quoted, 233. Lucian quoted, 104, 251, Note 104, Note 451, 507, 524, 546, 549. Lucretius, his Character, 114 quoted, 528 Luxury, its different Senses, 159, its advantages, 160, 161, its Disadvantages, 162, 166. Luxurious Ages most happy, 159, 163, most virtuous, 161.
Lysias, Genius of his Eloquence, 60, quoted, 239, 244, 245, 249, 251, 252, 254.

Machiavel, his Reflection on Christianity, [illegible] quoted, 18, 29, 32, 148, 250, 449, 542. [illegible] their Flesh, 533 Mallet, [illegible] of Egypt, quoted, [illegible] whence it is derived, [illegible] quoted, [illegible]

quoted, 524. Martial quoted, [illegible] Mary, Virgin, became a deity among the Catholics, 532. Massacres, ancient, enumerated from Diodorus Siculus, [illegible] Note Mathematics, their Foundation, 380, Note, their Advantages, 343. Maurice, Prince of Orange, his Saying, 465.
Melon, Monsieur, quoted, 151, 171, Note. Memory its Merit, whence derived, 451 Menander quoted, 118, Note. Merit, personal how the Object of Pride, 391 — Delineated, 467 Metaphysics, Science of, 311, 312
Mine Thine 424 Mixed Affections, 388.
Modesty whence its Merit, 463. Moliere, 78 Monarchy elective, hereditary, which preferable, 16. Monarchy and Republic their advantages and disadvantages with regard to the Arts 72, 73. Money, its continued Increase advantageous, 169. Its Diffusion advantageous, 169 Montaigne quoted, 499. Montesquieu quoted 224, 267, 425, Note. Monumentum Ancyrianum quoted, 257 Morals, their Standard, 134. — Not fluctuating, 509 Moral Causes have chief Influence on Populousness, 225 Muscovites, their National Manners 77
Nature, State of, described, 419. imaginary, 921, Note. Natural in what sense Justice is natural, 492, Note. Navigation, ancient, how imperfect 527
Necessity its Definition, 357 Negroes, their Character 123, Note Nepos, Cornelius, quoted 230. Neri and Banchi, Parties in Florence, 36 Newton, Sir I, his Rule of philosophizing, 429. —, Locke, Clarke Arians and Socinians 341, Note.
Nicholas, Saint became a Deity among the the Muscovites 532 Nisus, or strong Endeavour, not the Origin of the idea of Power, 340, Note.
Northern Nations, their swarms were no proof of more Populousness, 264.

Obedience, passive 285 Obligation, interested, to Virtue, 474
Olympiodorus quoted, 258
Opinion, Public, the real Foundation of Government, 23
Orange Family of, their Partisans, 41. Oratoribus Dialog de quoted, 124.
Ostracism, Athenian, Petalysm, Syracusan, character of 208
Ovid quoted, 65 74, 326, 262. 263, 524, 525

Painters, modern, unhappy in their Subjects, 133. Paper Credit and Banks, whether advantageous, 168, 189, 202. Parliament, how far it should be independent, 30 Parnel, Dr., his Character as a Writer, 116. Parties in General, 36, real, 38. — of Great Britain, 42 Pascal, his Character, 513 [illegible] their kinds, 385, their Objections and Causes, 390. Pausanias quoted, [illegible] 549. 266. Pathetic and Sublime, [illegible] Petronius quoted, [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] subsisting between Officers and [illegible] in ancient Armys, [illegible]
Persians, his [illegible] [illegible] their [illegible] [illegible]

derived, 39, 40, naturally attends the Principle of Unity of God, 537 Persia, ancient, whether possessed of an Aristocracy, 308 Personify, to, natural, and the Origin of Polytheism, 520 Petrarch, quoted, 230 Petronius, 229, 262, 509
Philip of Macedon, his Character in Demosthenes 459 —, his Occupation in the Infernal Regions, 104 Philip II of Spain, 54. Philosophy, the two Kinds of it, the obvious and abstruse, 309 Physical Causes, small Influence of, on Populousness, 514.
Pindar, his Scholiast, quoted, 192
Plato, quoted, 50 207, 251, 283, 420 Note, 520 Note Plautus, quoted, 252 Pliny the Elder quoted, 77, 131, 175, 193, 232, 259, 260, 518, 39, Note, 337, Note, 257, Note, 519, Note 536, Note — the Younger, his house 257, quoted 77 283 527 Plutarch quoted, 74, 75, 102 103 120, 126, 169, 184, 207, 210, 217, 218, 220, 230, 233 234, 237 239, 240 244, 249 250, 268, 412, 442, 458, 508 527 537 539, 549 — a Passage of his examined, 267
Politeness, whence its Merit, 463. Politics, a Science 14. Political Customs of Ancients and Moderns compared, 234. Pollia and Papiria, Roman Tribes their Animosity, 36 Polybius quoted 17 74, 175, 194, 201 202 236 249 255 262, 263, 275 435 450 498, 500, 31 Note 152, Note Polygamy, its Disadvantages, 107 Polytheism, the primitive Religion 518, its Origin 524 Pompey, his Superstition, 544 Pope, Mr, his Characte, 114, quoted, 14, 102 112 308 Power, what its Idea 345, 355, Note
Practice, how useful to Taste, 141 Prejudice, how hurtful to Taste, 142 Presbyterians, their character, 41 Presence, real, 542 Pressing Seamen 222 Priest his Character 117 Prior Mr quoted, 81 Pride whence it arises 390 Probability, what, 341 Promise what and whence its Obligation not the Origin of Government, 272 Proof what 341 Property, its Equality impracticable, 423, defended, 425 — why the Source of Pride, 394. Protestant Succession, its Advantages and Disadvantages, 292. Provinces, under what Government were they most oppressed, 16.
Pyrrhus, his Saying of the Romans 162

Quintilian quoted 54 59, 116, 441, 465, 546.

Racine, his Character, 114, quoted, 148
Reason, when it influences Action only a cooler Passion, 272. — how far the Source of Morals, 408 — and Taste their Boundaries, 136 — more precarious than Taste, 145 Reasons of State, 430. Refinement, in what respect useful, 175. Regnard, his Voyage to Lapland, quoted, 524. Relations of Ideas, one Object of Reason, 322. Religion, two principal Questions with regard to it, 514 — its first Principles not primary but secondary, 526. Resemblance a Source of Association, 319, 338. Retz, Cardinal de, quoted 303. Revolution, in 1688, gave no contract or Promise. 274

Rhamadan of the Turks, 551. Rhodes Number of its Inhabitants, 254.
Riches, why the Object among those of Pride or Esteem 394. 454
Rochefoucault quoted, 406, 496, Note Rome, 36, 51 53 116 — ancient, its Size and Number of Inhabitants, 258. — Name of its tutelar Deity Concealed, 536 Note Romans, when most corrupt, 55 anciently Pirates, 152 their Government under the Empire not burdensome, 167 Roman Empire, whether advantageous 267 The Roundhead Party, 41, Rousseau, J J, quoted, 73 Rowe, Mr, his Tragedy, censured, 132

Sallee, Prince of, his Saying of de Ruyter 542 Sallust quoted, 53, 74 163, 240, 258, 453, 497, 547, 552 Saint Evremond's Character of Turenne 449 — quoted, 457 Sannazarius, his Pastorals, of, 440.
Scapulaire, what, 534. Scepticism, 328, 332, excessive, 574, moderate, 375, with regard to the Senses, 375, with regard to reason 385 Sceptic, the, 93. Sciences their Division 93 Scholastic Religion, its usual Absurdity, 540 Scriptures holy, quoted 416, 499. Scriptural and traditional Religions compared, 545.
Selfish and Social, not opposite, 476. Self Love not the Foundation of moral Sentiment, 470 Seneca quoted 227, 231, 234, 258, 489 500, 525 Pliny the Elder quoted, 233 Sentiment, how far the Source of Morals 408, 473 Sextus Empiricus quoted 234, 414, 547
Shaftesbury, Lord, quoted, 51, 75, 219. Shakespeare his Artifice in Othello, 131 quoted, 457
Simplicity in Writing recommended, 113.
Slavery prejudicial to Populousness, 225 and — to Humanity 226
Sneezing, the God of, 519, Note.
Socrates, his Character, 460. Soil, very fertile no Advantage 158 Soldier, his Character, 117 Soldiers what Proportion they commonly bear to the People, 163. Sophocles, his Character, 114
Spain, ancient and Modern, its Inhabitants, 265 Spaniard his Politeness, 463. Sparta, its Policy, 151, — number of its Inhabitants, 254. Spartian quoted, 544 Spencer quoted 460 Sportula, the bad tendency of, 267
Statian quoted, 193 States, small, their advantages, 235. Stoic, the, 85. Stoics, their Idea of Providence, 360 — their Superstition, 373 Strabo, quoted, 228, 230, 231, 248, 251, 261, 263, 264, 266, 267 412, 216, Note, 257, Note 258, Note, 522, 538. Stuart Family, whether their Succession ought to have been retained, 292, whether restored, 297
Subjects particular, suit not with Refinement 149. Suetonius quoted, 17, 226 229, 257, 258, 259, 267, 367, Note, 505, 525 538, 544. Suidas quoted, 62, 63.
Swift, Dr, quoted, 185, 194, 201, Note, 243.
Sycophant, its original Sense, 184. Sympathy, the great Source of moral Sentiment, 430, 457. Syracuse, its Extent and Number of Inhabitants, 256.

Tacitus, somewhat superstitious, though profane, 546, quoted 12, 17, 41, 67, 75, 216, 231, 234 238, 257, 264, 268, 276, 329, 367, Note, 237, Note, 459, 542, Note, Note, 530, 546. Tasso quoted 51 82 Taste, its Standard, 134. Taxes when hurtful, 205, 206 — and do not fall ultimately on Land 207
Temple, Sir Will, 52, 125, 206 Tendency of Actions, not their accidental Consequences, regarded in Morals 473, Note Terence, his Character, 116, quoted, 75 146 Tertullian quoted 267

Thebes Number of its Inhabitants, 254. Theism, its Origin from Polytheism 539 Theism and Polytheism compared 536 Theocritus 249 Thinkers abstruse how useful, shallow, 269 Thucydides the first Historian, 249 — Quoted 104, 152, 193, 200, 236 240 245 248, 251 252 255
Timon of Athens his Affection to Alcibiades, 442 Timotheus the poet his Hymn to Diana, criticised, 549
Toleration naturally attends Polytheism 536 Tory Party, 40, their speculative system 270 Tot, Mons du, quoted, 171 Tournefort Mons., 110, 261
Tragedy, why it pleases, 128 Tranquillity of Mind whence its Merit, 460. Treasures, their Effects, 189
Turkish the, Government 207
Tyrannicide, why blameable, 415 Tyrants, ancient, their Cruelty, 240.

Ustariz, Geronimo de, quoted, 224. Usurpation, what, 275.
Utility a Source of Approbation, 413, 413. — To others, 412, to ourselves, 455.

Valerius Maximus quoted, 257, Note. Vanity, allies easily to Virtue, 49,—why blamed 466 Varro quoted, 229, 232, 544 Vauban quoted, 233, 262.
Vega, Garcillasso de la, quoted, 182 Verna, its Sense, and Inferences from it, 229. Verney Parisde, quoted 171, Violo Note. Victor Publius, quoted, 254, 257, Note. Virgil his character 114, quoted, 453, 489, Virtue and Vice defined, 410. Vis Inertiae, 317, Note Vitellius, his meanness 450 Vitruvius quoted, 257
Voluntary and involuntary why made by the Moderns so essential to Morals, 501 Voltaire quoted, 13 Vopiscus quoted, 254, 259, 259, Note Vossius quoted, 222.

Waller, the poet his character, 79.
Wisdom its Merit whence, 450. Wit or Ingenuity its Merit, whence 463.
Whig Party 43, speculative system of, 270.
Wolsey, Cardinal 75. Women, are timorous and superstitious, 522

Xenophon his superstition, 546, Note. — Quoted 50, 55 199 200, 231 236, 241, 246, 252 254 263 Xerxes, his Pursuit of new Pleasures, 80.

BRADBURY AGNEW, & CO. LD., PRINTERS LONDON AND TONBRIDGE

9 **THE BRIDE OF LAMMERMOOR** With 130 Illustrations by G DURAND, BROWN, ERIZ, C GILBERT, MONTADER, RIOU, and VIDAL

10 **THE FAIR MAID OF PERTH** With 140 Illustrations by AD MARIE, C DETTI, CH GOSSELIN, KURNER, A LEMAISTER, H PILLE, and F TALUET

11 **OLD MORTALITY** With 140 Illustrations by D MAILLART, GOSSELIN, KAUFMANN, PELLICER, PRANISHNIKOFF, and H SCOTT

12 **WOODSTOCK** With 150 Illustrations by E TOUDOUZE.

13 **REDGAUNTLET** With 160 Illustrations by GODEFROY DURAND.

14 **THE MONASTERY** With 130 Illustrations by DUNKI, DETTI, KURNER, FR FLEMING, GOSSELIN, and SCOTT

15 **THE ABBOT** With 130 Illustrations by FR FLEMING, DETTI, DUNKI, FERDINANDUS, KURNER, and GOSSELIN

16 **PEVERIL OF THE PEAK** With 150 Illustrations by ADRIEN MOREAU

17 **THE PIRATE** With 150 Illustrations by AD LALAUZE

18 **ANNE OF GEIERSTEIN** With 150 Illustrations by DUNKI

19 **THE FORTUNES OF NIGEL** With 168 Illustrations by HUYOT

20 **THE TALISMAN** With 68 Illustrations by A DE RICHEMONT, A DE PARYS, and WALTER PAGET

21 **THE BETROTHED and THE BLACK DWARF** With 120 Illustrations by A FORESTIER, RIOU, GILBERT, and GODEFROY DURAND

22 **A LEGEND OF MONTROSE and CASTLE DANGEROUS.** With 76 Illustrations by WALTER PAGET and A DE PARYS

23 **CHRONICLES OF THE CANONGATE** Containing "Chronicles of the Canongate," "The Two Drovers," "The Highland Widow," and "The Surgeon's Daughter" With 68 Illustrations by A FORESTIER, RAYMOND POTTER, and A DE PARYS

24 **ST. RONAN'S WELL** With 68 Illustrations by ROBERT SAUBER

25 **COUNT ROBERT OF PARIS** With 78 Illustrations by A. FORESTIER

LONDON. WARD, LOCK & CO, LTD, SALISBURY SQUARE, E.C.

THE WORLD LIBRARY—*continued*

3s 6d per volume

24 **LORD BACON** · Proficience and Advancement of Learning, Historical Sketches and Essays 530 pp

25 **ESSAYS BY THOMAS DE QUINCEY.** Confessions of an Opium Eater, &c 550 pp

26 **JOSEPHUS (The Complete Works of).** By WHISTON. 810 pp

27 **PALEY'S WORKS** "The Evidences of Christianity," "Horæ Paulinæ," and "Natural Theology." With Life and Notes.

28 **TAYLOR'S HOLY LIVING AND DYING.** With Life, Introduction, and Notes

29 **DEAN MILMAN'S HISTORY OF THE JEWS.** 520 pp

31 **LOCKE ON THE HUMAN UNDERSTANDING.** 670 pp.

32 **PLUTARCH'S LIVES** By LANGHORNE 750 pp

33 **ADDISON'S ESSAYS from "Spectator."**

36 **TODD'S COMPLETE WORKS.** Sunday School Teacher, Lectures for Young Men, &c 920 pp

37 **D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.** 870 pp

43 **NEWMAN SMYTH'S WORKS.** Containing "Old Faiths in New Light," "The Religious Feeling," and "Orthodox Theology"

44 **HALLAM'S LITERATURE OF EUROPE** during the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries Complete. 900 pp.

45 **LAMB'S ESSAYS OF ELIA AND ELIANA.** 850 pp.

48 **PALGRAVE'S HISTORY OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS.**

49 **THE LIFE OF NAPOLEON BONAPARTE.** By J S C ABBOTT

50-51 **GIBBON'S ROMAN EMPIRE.** With the Valuable and Copious Notes of the late DEAN MILMAN Two Vols, 2,300 pp.

53 **FORSTER'S LIFE AND TIMES OF OLIVER GOLDSMITH.** Illustrated by MACLISE, STANFIELD and others.

54 **COOK'S BOSTON MONDAY LECTURES.**

A Selection of Gift Books.

MATTHEW HENRY'S COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE With Memoir and Prefatory Essay Six volumes, Imp 8vo. cloth, 63s, half-calf or half morocco, 84s

THE STANDARD DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. 5,000 Engravings and Coloured Plates, 301,865 words (or, 75,000 more than any other dictionary) Half Russia, one vol, 60s, two vols., 70s Full Russia, one vol, 70s, two vols., 84s Full Morocco, one vol, 84s, two vols, 100s.

CLARKE'S (DR. ADAM) COMMENTARY ON THE HOLY BIBLE Containing the AUTHOR'S LATEST CORRECTIONS Unabridged Edition, 6,000 pages, with many Engravings Maps, Plans, &c In Six Volumes, super-royal 8vo, cloth, price 52s 6d, half-calf or half morocco, 78s

HAYDN'S DICTIONARY OF DATES AND UNIVERSAL INFORMATION Relating to All Ages and Nations ENLARGED, CORRECTED, and REVISED THROUGHOUT Medium 8vo, cloth, 21s, half-calf, 25s, full or tree calf, 31s 6d

VIOLIN MAKING as it Was and as it Is An Historical, Theoretical, and Practical Treatise on the Art, for the use of all Violin Makers and Players, Amateur and Professional Preceded by an Essay on the Violin and its position as a Musical Instrument By EDWARD HERON ALLEN With Photographs, Folding Supplements, and 200 Engravings Demy 8vo, cloth gilt, 10s 6d

THE UNIVERSAL INSTRUCTOR or, Self-Culture for All A Complete Cyclopædia of Learning and Self Education, meeting the requirements of all Classes of Students, and forming a Perfect System of Intellectual Culture With 2,000 Illustrations In Three Volumes, royal 8vo, each 7s 6d half calf or half morocco, 12s

HOUSEHOLD MEDICINE A Guide to Good Health, Long Life, and the Proper Treatment of all Diseases and Ailments. Edited by GEORGE BLACK, M.B, Edin Accurately illustrated with 450 Engravings. Royal 8vo, cloth gilt, 7s. 6d, half-calf, 12s 6d

THE ILLUSTRATED HISTORY OF THE WORLD, for the English People From the Earliest Period to the Present time Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern Profusely Illustrated with High-class Engravings. Complete in Two Volumes, royal 8vo, cloth gilt, price 7s 6d each, half calf or half morocco, 12s each.

NOBLE THOUGHTS IN NOBLE LANGUAGE A Collection of Wise and Virtuous Utterances, in Prose and Verse, from the Writings of the Known Great and the Great Unknown. With an INDEX OF AUTHORS, and Full-page Illustrations. Compiled and Analytically arranged by HENRY SOUTHGATE, Author of "Many Thoughts of Many Minds," &c. Royal 8vo, cloth gilt, 7s. 6d., half-calf or half-morocco, 12s

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO., LIMITED, SALISBURY SQUARE, E.C.

A SELECTION OF GIFT BOOKS—continued.

THE SCIENCE OF THE HAND Or, The Art of Recognising the Tendencies of the Human Mind by the Observation of the Formation of the Hands. Translated from the French of D Arpentigny, and Edited, with a Commentary on the Text, Notes, &c , by EDWARD HERON ALLEN With illustrations by MISS HORSLEY Imp 16mo, parchment, bevelled, red edges, 7s 6d

EVERY MAN HIS OWN MECHANIC A Complete Guide to every description of Construction and Decorative Work that may be done by an Amateur Artisan By FRANCIS CHILTON YOUNG 'Series of "Amateur Work, Illustrated'" With 850 Wood Engravings and Three Folding Supplements 18th Edition. Medium 8vo, cloth gilt, 7s 6d , half calf, 12s

HOME CARPENTRY FOR HANDY MEN By FRANCIS CHILTON YOUNG, Author of ' Every Man His own Mechanic, &c With over 550 Illustrations Medium 8vo, 784 pages, cloth, 7s 6d By the aid of this book any man who can handle a tool can work wonders in the way of improving his home and surroundings.

A POPULAR HISTORY OF ENGLAND From the Earliest Times to the year 1897, the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. Comprising also a Summary of the History of the Nations of Europe By H W DULCKEN Ph D With Full page Illustrations and Hundreds of Engravings. Royal 8vo, cloth gilt, 7s 6d , half calf or half morocco, 12s 6d

POPULAR SCIENTIFIC RECREATIONS A Storehouse of Instruction and Amusement By HENRY FRITH With 1,000 Illustrations. Royal 8vo 900 pages, cloth gilt 7s 6d , half calf or half morocco, 12s

THE WORLD'S RELIGIONS, Describing the Doctrines, Rise, Practices, Priesthoods, and Moral Teachings of all the Principal Religions of the Present Day and Past Times By G T BETTANY M A , B Sc , Author of ' The World Inhabitants, &c With about 300 Engravings Royal 8vo, 900 pages, cloth gilt 7s 6d , half calf, 12s

THE WORLD'S INHABITANTS, or Mankind Animals and Plants Being a Popular Description of the Races and Peoples now inhabiting the Globe, their Origin, History, Manners and Customs By G T BETTANY, M A , B Sc. With nearly 1,000 Wood Engravings Royal 8vo, 900 pages, cloth gilt, 7s 6d , half calf, 12s

A MANUAL OF CHEIROSOPHY A Practical Handbook of Cheirognomy and Cheiromancy, by means whereof the Past, the Present, and the Future may be read in the Formation of the Hands. By EDWARD HERON-ALLEN With Engravings by ROSAMUND B HORSLEY Imperial 16mo, parchment, red edges, 5s.

WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, STATESMAN AND SCHOLAR. A Literary and Critical Biography Edited by DAVID WILLIAMSON. With many Portraits and Illustrations. Being a thoroughly comprehensive and careful chronicle of the life-work in politics, theology, and literature, of probably the busiest man of the century Demy 8vo, canvas gilt, 5s

LONDON: WARD, LOCK & CO., LIMITED, SALISBURY SQUARE, E.C.